

THE ANNALS  
of the  
UKRAINIAN ACADEMY  
of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.

---

VOL. IV-V

SUMMER-FALL, 1955

No. 4 (14)-1 (15)

---

Special Issue

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE  
SOUTHERN UKRAINE  
(1750-1775)

N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko

---

Published by

THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
IN THE U.S., Inc.



---

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

DMITRY ČIŽEVSKY  
*Harvard University*

OLEKSANDER GRANOVSKY  
*University of Minnesota*

ROMAN SMAL STOCKI  
*Marquette University*

VOLODYMYR P. TIMOSHENKO  
*Stanford University*

EDITOR

MICHAEL VETUKHIV  
*Columbia University*

TECHNICAL EDITOR

HENRY M. NEBEL, JR.

---

*The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.* are published quarterly by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., Inc. A *Special issue* will take place of 2 issues.

All correspondence, orders, and remittances should be sent to  
*The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.*  
11½ West 26th Street, New York 10, N. Y.

PRICE OF THIS ISSUE: \$5.00

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: \$6.00

A special rate is offered to libraries and graduate and undergraduate students in the fields of Slavic studies.

Copyright 1955, by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S., Inc.

THE ANNALS  
of the  
UKRAINIAN ACADEMY  
of Arts and Sciences in the U. S.

---

VOL. IV-V

SUMMER-FALL, 1955

No. 4 (14)-1 (15)

---

Special Issue

THE SETTLEMENT OF THE  
SOUTHERN UKRAINE  
(1750-1775)

N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko

---

Published by

THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  
IN THE U.S., Inc.



THE ANNALS OF THE UKRAINIAN ACADEMY OF  
ARTS AND SCIENCES IN THE U. S., INC.

---

SPECIAL ISSUE

---

CONTENTS

*page*

Introduction ..... 1

PART ONE

COLONIZATION OF NOVA SERBIYA AND  
SLAVYANOSERBIYA

- I. The Return of the Zaporozhians to their "Free  
Lands" ..... 5
- II. Colonization of the "Places Beyond the Dnepr" and  
the "Ukrainian Line" ..... 19
- III. Recruitment of Foreign Colonists and the Plan to  
Establish Military Settlements in Nova Serbiya and  
Slavyanoserbiya ..... 40
- IV. The Territory of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya 50
- V. The Administration of Nova Serbiya and Slavyano-  
serbiya ..... 75
- VI. The Foreign Population of Nova Serbiya and Slavy-  
anoserbiya ..... 102
- VII. The Ukrainian Population of Nova Serbiya and Sla-  
vyanoserbiya ..... 121
- VIII. Concluding Remarks on the Colonization of Nova  
Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya ..... 163

PART TWO

SETTLEMENT OF THE PROVINCE OF NEW RUSSIA

- I. The Territory of the Province of New Russia .... 181
- II. Administration of the Province of New Russia .... 193
- III. Plan of Settlement of the Province of New Russia 200

IV. Distribution of Land to Landlords and the Settling of Estates .....	218
V. Colonization of State Settlements and Towns	
A. State Settlements .....	238
B. Town Population .....	257
VI. Some Conclusions on Colonization .....	266
VII. Relations between the Settlers of the New Russia Province and the Zaporozhians .....	290
Bibliographical Note .....	333
Bibliography .....	339
Map .....	351
Index to the Map .....	351
A Note on Transliteration .....	353
Editor's Note .....	354

## PREFACE

This work is the result of more than thirty years research in the archives of the Ukraine and Moscow. Originally, *The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine, 1750-1775*, was to be the first volume of a broader historical work—*The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine in the Eighteenth Century*. The second volume of this work was to be *The Settlement of the Southern Ukraine, 1775-1797*, but it was lost during the Second World War.

The author wishes to acknowledge the help and assistance of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U. S., especially, its president, Professor M. O. Vetukhiv; the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. and its assistant director, Dr. Robert Slusser; the translator, Professor Ihor Ševčenko; Dr. Mark Raeff, who helped in the preliminary editing, and Professor O. P. Ohloblyn, who helped during the final editing of the work.

N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko

The translating and editing of this study were carried out with the assistance of the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. (East European Fund, Inc.). Its publication as a *Special Issue* of the *Annals* was facilitated by a grant from the Research Program.

The views of the author are her own and do not necessarily represent these of the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. or the East European Fund.



## INTRODUCTION

The subject of the present work is the colonization of the Southern Ukraine in the middle of the eighteenth century, the period in which this movement reached its peak.

The years 1734 and 1775 were chosen as the chronological boundaries of this study. The first date marked the release of the Zaporozhian Cossacks from the Tatar protectorate and the foundation of the New Sich (*Nova Sich*) on the Pidpil'na River; the second, the liquidation of the Zaporozhian Sich. This period was characterized by features distinguishing it from the years which preceded and followed.

During the period of the New Zaporozhian Sich the colonizing activity was intensified. The Zaporozhian nobility (*starshyna*), in the process of strengthening and consolidating, strove to develop the rural economy in these regions, which led to an ever-growing struggle with the Russian authorities for the land.

The establishment of Nova Serbiya (New Serbia) and Slavynoserbiya (Slavic Serbia), foreign military colonies, founded partly on the borders of Zaporozhian "Free Lands" (*Vol'nosti*, i. e. privileged territories) and partly on these Zaporozhian lands proper, is the second salient feature of the period under discussion. Their purpose was to protect the Russian frontiers from Tatar incursions as well as from possible complications which might arise in dealing with the Zaporozhian Cossacks. However, these colonies did not justify the hopes and the trust put in them by the authorities; they failed to form a reliable bulwark, but, instead, were the first step of the Russian authorities towards the destruction of Zaporizhzhya.

A third feature was the abolishment of the Serbian colonies and the establishment of the province of New Russia (*Novorossiiskaya guberniya*) in their stead. The Russian authorities, in penetrating more and more deeply into the Zaporozhian steppes, were preparing the destruction of Zaporizhzhya. This whole period is characterized by an incessant and increasingly active colonization in the direction of Southern Ukraine. Ukrainian and Russian peasants were fleeing serfdom's evertightening grip.

Masses of settlers from the Left-Bank Ukraine and from Russia were joined by those from the Right-Bank Ukraine, when the extensive privileges by which the landlords had lured settlers to abandoned lands were curtailed. Then, too, towards the middle of the eighteenth century both the Russian government and the Zaporozhian nobility began to use all means to attract settlers to the Southern Ukraine. Settlements (*slobody*, privileged communities) and towns, organized by the state or the landlords, were set up. In this period the flow of Russian and Ukrainian capital is hardly noticeable. The establishment of the Serbian military colonies and the province of New Russia, half military in character, was to protect the landlords of the Left-Bank and and of Slobids'ka Ukraine (part of the Left-Bank Ukraine) from Tatar and Zaporozhian incursions from the south. At that time, Ukrainian and Russian landlords did not dare come to these territories, so fraught with insecurity and danger. Therefore the majority of landlords, who had been allotted lands there, were officers of local regiments and employees of the local chanceries. Only the more enterprising and versatile representatives of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, most of them Russian, came there, founding mills and factories and establishing commercial relations.

The year 1775, the end of the period under discussion, is a decisive date between two epochs. By the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainardji (1774), Russia gained control over the Black Sea littoral, which opened a broad route for commercial relations with both Asia and Europe. The Crimean protectorate guaranteed that the Ukraine would not be molested by Tatar invasions. The destruction of the Zaporozhian Sich, which had presented an obstacle to the movement of Russian capital in the direction of the Black Sea, introduced a radical change in the position of the country. The vast area of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" was incorporated in the provinces of New Russia and Azov (Oziv). These lands then became the field of expansion for Ukrainian and Russian landlords. Huge latifundia were founded there, whose wheat and other agricultural produce were channeled towards the Black Sea ports.

Thus, these years constitute an independent and distinct period in the history of the colonization of the Southern Ukraine. During this time, Ukrainian and Russian settlers were arriving in an irrepressible flow, ignoring the dangers and, often, conflicting wishes of the government. They were fleeing serfdom, religious persecution, and other forms of oppression. There was a constant ambivalence in the tsarist attitude towards these people: on one hand, as the guardian of the landlords' interests, it used every means to prevent the peasant serfs from leaving their landlords' estates; on the other, since it endeavored to colonize the Southern Ukraine in the shortest possible time (which was also in the landlords' interests), the tsarist government could not be too severe with the peasants who had fled to the south. Therefore, local representatives of the authorities concealed the peasants' presence and tried to prevent their return to their owners. Thus the attitude towards the refugees which resulted in the province of New Russia was similar to that in Zaporizhzhya. Here, these refugees populated the settlements, towns, and landlords' grants (*dacha*). The only wealth was their habit of work. They, rather than the foreign colonists who enjoyed an official patronage often detrimental to the Ukrainian population, laid the cornerstone for the culture of that area. The Ukrainian people was the principal hero of the epoch, defending this land from the enemy with its own blood and laying the cultural cornerstone of these territories with its own work.



## PART ONE

### COLONIZATION OF NOVA SERBIYA AND SLAVYANOSERBIYA

#### I. THE RETURN OF THE ZAPOROZHIAN TO THEIR "FREE LANDS"

The aim of this work is to elucidate certain historical features of the colonization of the Southern Ukraine. However, a discussion of the question of the frontiers of Zaporizhzhya and, specifically, the question of how the Zaporozhians and their neighbors conceived these frontiers, especially the northern one, cannot be avoided.

The earliest document delineating the frontiers of Zaporizhzhya, to which the Zaporozhians referred in all difficult contingencies, was the charter (*hramota*) issued by King Stefan Batory on August 20, 1576. The original was lost, but its contents are known from a copy of the proclamation (*universal*) of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, dating from January 15, 1655.<sup>1</sup> In this charter, Stefan Batory confirmed the rights of the Zaporozhian Cossacks to the city of Chyhyryn (Chigirin) and granted them the city of Terekhtemyriv with its monastery and ford across the Dnepr:

His Majesty grants to the Zaporozhian Cossacks of the Lower (*nyzovyi*) Dnepr in perpetuity: the town of Terekhtemyriv, its monastery and ford, and, in addition to their ancient supply base, the Zaporozhian town of Chyhyryn; also all the lands with all... towns, villages, homesteads, fishing grounds, and other appendages

<sup>1</sup> A. A. Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi, ili poslednyago Kosha Zaporozhskago, na osnovanii podlinnykh dokumentov zaporozhskago sechevogo arkhiva* [History of New Sich, or the Last Camp of the Zaporozhians, written on the Basis of Original Documents of the Zaporozhian Sich Archives], 3rd ed., Odessa, 1885-86, F, 12-14; III, 275-77. Appendix No. 1. cf., also, D. I. Evarnitski (Yavornyts'kyi), *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kozakov* [History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks], St. Petersburg, 1895, II, 58-60. Although both authors print the same proclamation, their editions differ slightly. Skal'kovski used a copy authenticated by the Host's Secretary General, Hloba, and preserved in the Zaporozhian Archives, while Evarnitski based his edition on a copy preserved in *Moskovskoye otdeleniye Obshchevo arkhiva Glavnogo shtaba* [Moscow Section of the General Archives of the General Staff].

from the aforementioned town of Terekhtemyriv down along the Dnepr to Chyhyryn and the Zaporozhian steppe... and across from the Dnepr towards the steppe; the lands of these towns, villages, homesteads which have of old belonged to them are to be ruled by them in the future as well; the old little Zaporozhian town of Samara with its ford and lands extending upstream along the Dnepr to the Orel River and downstream to the very Nogai and Crimean steppes and across the Dnepr and the Dnepr *liman*\* (silted estuaries) and of the Southern Bug (Boh) *liman*... and up the Southern Bug to the Synyukha (Sinyukha) River, and from the lands of the Samara, across the steppe to the Don River itself where the Zaporozhian Cossacks used to have their winter quarters as early as the times of the Cossack Hetman Pretslav Lantskorons'kyi.<sup>2</sup>

This charter mentions the very northern frontier of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands," the frontiers which the Zaporozhians always insisted upon. No wonder, then, that they persisted in trying to prove the authenticity of these documents, although only copies of the charter and the proclamation were preserved in the archives. And the Russian government was also interested in the question of the authenticity of these documents. Early in the year 1775 it entrusted the historian G. F. Müller Miller) with the task of searching the archives for the originals of these copies, but they were not found. Müller was also the first to point out that the charter of Stefan Batory contains many anachronisms and later interpolations.<sup>3</sup>

The Treaty of April 26, 1686 confirming the "Eternal Peace" between Poland and Russia provided for the cession of the whole Zaporozhian territory between Sich and the mouth of the Tyasmyn (Tyasmin) River, which should pass "into the possession and under the sovereignty of the great Tsars (*Gosudari*, i. e., Peter I and his brother Ivan) ... with all the "Free Lands"

<sup>2</sup> Skal'kovski, *op. cit.*, III, 170.

<sup>3</sup> G. F. Miller, *Istoričeskiye sočineniya o Malorossii. Razsuzhdeniya o zaporozhskakh* [Historical Works on Little Russia. Considerations on the Zaporozhians], Moscow, 1846, pp. 43-4. L. P. (Padalka), "Proiskhozhdeniye zaporozhskago kozachestva" [The origin of the Zaporozhian Cossacks], *Kiyevskaya starina*, X, 1884, 44. Evarnitski, *op. cit.*, p. 60; see also, his *Vol'nosti zaporozhskikh kozakov* [The Free Lands of the Zaporozhian Cossacks], St. Petersburg, 1896, p. 3.

existing of old; and from the mouth of the Tyasmyn River the border is to run upwards across the steppe in a straight line, bypassing Chyhyryn."<sup>4</sup> The western boundary of the Zaporozhian lands, as defined in the Treaty of Karlowitz (1699), ran along the river Synyukha.<sup>5</sup>

Thus, towards the end of the seventeenth century, the frontier of the Zaporozhian lands, which were situated on the right bank of the Dnepr, was approximately fixed. In the north it ran along the Tyasmyn and Synyukha rivers and in the west it followed the Southern Bug. It was not until 1703 that we find the Zaporozhians attempting to establish a frontier along the Samara River, but their claims were not supported by Hetman Mazepa.<sup>6</sup>

The beginning of the eighteenth century brought a radical change in the position of the Zaporozhian Cossacks and a *volte-face* in their relations with the Russian government. The Zaporozhian Cossacks, led by their Camp Chief (*koshovyi otaman*), Kost' Hordiyenko, sided with Mazepa.<sup>7</sup> The Zaporozhian Sich was subsequently destroyed by the Russian army. After the defeat of the Swedes at Poltava the Cossacks came under the "protection" of the Crimean Khan and founded their Sich in Oleshky (Aleshki).

Meanwhile, the terms of the Pruth Treaty (1711), unfavorable to Russia, gave Turkey all the territory which the Zaporozhians considered their own. The new frontier ran from Azov to the middle of the Orel River and followed the course of that river to its mouth, then it ran along the Dnepr up to Kryliv (Krylov), touched the sources of the rivers Irkley (Irkli), Inhulets (Ingulets), Inhul (Ingul), Vys', and followed the current of the Syny-

<sup>4</sup> *Polnoye sobraniye zakonov rossiiskoi imperii* [Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire], No. 1186, April 26, 1686. Abbreviated as *PSZ*.

<sup>5</sup> Evarnitski, *Vol'nosti* . . . , p. 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>7</sup> N. L. Yunakov, "Dokumenty severnoi voiny" (Documents of the Northern War), *Trudy Imperatorskago Russkago Voyenno-istoricheskago Obshchestva* (Proceedings of the Imperial Russian Military Historical Society), vol. III, p. 112; S. M. Solov'yev, *Istoriya Rossii* (History of Russia), bk. III, p. 1544. Hetman Mazepa sided with King Charles XII of Sweden against Peter the Great.

ukha River to the point where the latter joined the Southern Bug.<sup>8</sup>

It might seem that the Zaporozhians could now quietly return to their former settlements. Instead, they did not consider that they had the right to return there, but, sitting in Oleshky, they asked the Russian government for the permission to migrate to the Chortomlyk (Chertomlyk) to re-establish their camp (*kish*). Such were the contents of their petition addressed to Hetman Skoropads'kyi in 1714. In reply to this request, the Russian government only permitted individual Cossacks who "acknowledged their guilt" to return to "Little Russia" and settle "wherever [they] had been born." The Zaporozhian nobility was promised "distinguished ranks in the regiments." The Russian government, however, considered it impossible "to accept them as subjects and take over the land which they inhabited, or to permit them to live in Old Sich" because these territories belonged to Turkey.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, the Zaporozhians continued to petition the Russian government to forgive their offenses and permit a return to their former settlements. Without their request being granted, the Zaporozhians went to the Chortomlyk River in 1728, occupied certain territories along the Samara River and sent another petition to Peter II asking him to accept them in his "service." At the same time they notified the Tsar that they "renounced Moslem sovereignty."<sup>10</sup> This affair was examined by the Supreme Secret Council (*Verkhovnyi Tainyi Sovet*), which issued a decree to Field Marshal General Prince

<sup>8</sup> PSZ, No. 2398, July 12, 1711; S. M. Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, IV, 72; D. I. Evarnitski, *Volnosti . . .*, pp. 7-10.

<sup>9</sup> A. A. Andriyevski, *Materialy dlya istorii yuzhno-russkogo kraya v XVIII stol., izvelechnyye iz starykh del kieuskago gub. arkhiva* [Materials for the History of the South Russian Territory in the XVIII century, extracted from the Ancient Acts of the Kiev Government Archives], Odessa, 1886 (an offprint from *Zapiski odesskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei* [Notes of the Historical and Antiquarian Society of Odessa], XIV); Evarnitski, *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kazakov*, St. Petersburg, 1897, III, 516 f.

<sup>10</sup> D. I. Evarnitski, *Istochniki dlya istorii zaporozhskikh kazakov* [Sources for the History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks], Vladimir, 1903, II, 1083-1101; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, IV, 1110-1112.



M. M. Golitsyn, enjoining him "not to admit the Zaporozhians past the Russian frontiers under any pretext, not to give them any protection, and to repel them from the frontiers by force of arms."<sup>11</sup> The Zaporozhians remained at the mouth of the Chortomyk for about two years. In 1730 they returned "to the protection" of the Crimean Khan.<sup>12</sup>

Leaving the Chortomyk, the Zaporozhians did not settle in Oleshky again but established themselves at the mouth of the Kamyanka (Kamenka) River. It should be remembered that not all the Zaporozhian Cossacks went to Oleshky in 1709. While the Cossacks of the Sich constituted the bulk of these settlers, a considerable number of Zaporozhians stayed in their old territories on the Samara in winter quarters (*zymivnyky*) and farmsteads (*khutory*). They earned their livelihood by stockbreeding and various other activities. However, the contacts between those who left and those who remained continued.<sup>13</sup> Prince Myshetski has outlined the complicated relationship between the two groups of Cossacks: The Sich Cossacks considered the Samara Cossacks their subjects and tried to exploit them, thereby prompting the latter to an act of vengeance. Having learned that the Sich Cossacks had left for a campaign against the Circassians, the Samara Cossacks overran and sacked the Sich (which at that time was still at Oleshky).<sup>14</sup>

The life of the Cossacks under the Crimean protectorate was difficult. True, they were exempted from all taxation, but they were also deprived of their customary means of livelihood. The sandy soil of the Oleshky region made stockbreeding, or the establishment of winter quarters, impossible. Moreover, they could not fish in the Crimea; only hunting was left to them. The right granted them to extract salt from Crimean lakes (a right

<sup>11</sup> Andriyevski, "Materialy . . .", *Zapiski odesskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XIV, 288; Evarnitski, *Istoriya . . .*, III, 543 f.; *Istochniki . . .*, II, 1126-1137.

<sup>12</sup> Evarnitski, *Istoriya . . .*, III, 551.

<sup>13</sup> Andriyevski, "Materialy . . .", *op. cit.*, pp. 2-8.

<sup>14</sup> Myshetski, "Istoriya o kozakakh zaporozhskikh," [History Concerning the Zaporozhian Cossacks], *Chteniya v obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* [Communications of the Society for Russian History and Antiquities at Moscow University], 1847, no. 6, Miscellanea II.

initially coupled with a tariff reduction) did not provide adequate compensation, since the Cossacks were forbidden to trade in the Crimea and Ochakiv (Ochakov), while commerce in the Sich was open to everybody, Greeks, Tatars, and the inhabitants of Ochakiv. The only substantial source of revenue was provided by the fords across the Dnepr and the Southern Bug, where the Cossacks levied a toll for every wagon and each head of cattle. Myshetski, who knew the situation of the Zaporozhians well, wrote that "the life of the Cossacks under Crimean rule was very difficult; in no respect did they enjoy complete liberty."<sup>15</sup> As time went on, the position of the Zaporozhians became less and less tenable, and their relations with the Tatars gradually deteriorated. Thus, they had to pay the customary tax in full on the salt they extracted; they were sent to work at earthworks in Perekop and, if they tried to escape, they were severely punished; they were burdened with various tributes, etc. The obligation to perform military service and to participate in Tatar campaigns was the most burdensome, since the latter always strove to impose the most difficult assignments on the Cossacks and to send them into remote regions.<sup>16</sup> No wonder, then, that it was more and more difficult for the Zaporozhians to remain under the "Tatar protectorate."

Soon, however, circumstances took a turn more favourable to the Zaporozhians. In 1731, a project of Count Weissbach (Weissbakh), commander of the armies stationed in the Ukraine and Governor General of Kiev, was put into effect. The construction of a line of fortifications was begun, running from the Bohorodyts'kyi retrenchment at the mouth of the Samara to the Donets River. These fortifications were to protect the Russian frontier from possible Tatar or Turkish incursions. Weissbach himself was entrusted with the construction of this "Ukrainian Line." The building of these fortifications and their defense required a huge supply of man power and proved a severe imposition upon the sparse Ukrainian population of this region. Under these circumstances, Weissbach considered the return of the

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 11 f.

<sup>16</sup> Evarnitski, *Istoriya . . .*, III, 555-558.

Zaporozhians to be very desirable and renewed secret negotiations with them. He even declared his readiness to assume the role of mediator between them and the Empress Anne. The Russian government, however, refused to consent to the return of the Zaporozhians for a long time, fearing complications in its diplomatic relations with Turkey.<sup>17</sup> This state of affairs lasted until 1733, when, following the death of the Polish King Augustus II, the war of succession began in Poland between the two pretenders to the throne, Frederick-Augustus (the son of Augustus), supported by Austria and Russia, and Stanislaw Leszczyński, supported by Poland and France. To secure their success, the adherents of Leszczyński sought the assistance of Turkey, the Crimea, and the Zaporozhians.

The Russian government was faced with the choice of either having the Zaporozhians as adversaries or accepting them as subjects. At that very time the Zaporozhians sent their envoys to Field Marshal Münnich (Minikh), stationed with his army in the Ukraine, and asked once more to be allowed to return and be accepted "under the Russian sceptre." In reply to this request, which Münnich supported, Empress Anne issued the charter of August 31, 1733. In this charter, which was couched in vague terms, the Zaporozhians were pardoned for all their offenses and promised "favor" (*milost'*) in the future. The document does not contain a single explicit statement; there is not one reference to the permission to resettle, or to the boundaries of the Zaporozhian territories, or to the rights of the Zaporozhians to the lands on which they intended to settle.<sup>18</sup> This vagueness was responsible for misunderstandings between the Zaporozhians and the Russian government for many years to come.

Towards the beginning of 1734 the Crimean Khan demanded that the Zaporozhians participate in a campaign in Poland on

<sup>17</sup> Myshetski, *op. cit.*, p. 13; Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 38-40; Evarnitski, *Istoriya* . . . , III, 552-54, 558-60.

<sup>18</sup> D. N. Bantysh-Kamenski, *Istoriya Maloi Rossii* [History of Little Russia], 1882, IV, 227; Miller, "Razsuzhdeniya o zaporozhtsakh" [Considerations on Zaporozhians], *Chteniya v obshch. ist. i drevn. ross. pri mosk. universitete*, 1845, No. 5, p. 60; A. I. Rigel'man, *Letopismoye povestvovaniye o Maloi Rossii* [A Chronicle Narrative of Little Russia], Moscow, 1847, III, Part V, 140f.

behalf of Leszczynski's candidacy. It was impossible to prolong further the ambiguous situation. Without answering the Khan, the Zaporozhians set out from their quarters. While on their way, they dispatched a messenger to Count Weissbach, notifying him of what had happened and asking for further instructions. Taking advantage of a raid by the Nogai Tatars, subjects of Turkey, on the village of Byrkut, Count Weissbach reported this action to the Russian government as a violation of the peace treaty by Turkey and suggested that the Zaporozhians be accepted as subjects. At the same time he sent a note to the Zaporozhians which gave them grounds for hope. On this basis, the Zaporozhians moved farther on, establishing their camp on the Pidpil'na River on the landmark called Bazavluk.<sup>19</sup> By the terms of the Pruth Treaty, this territory was situated within Turkish boundaries, but they disregarded this fact.

It is interesting to note that the question of rights to these lands was the subject of a prolonged and animated discussion, in the course of which contradictory views were expressed. In his "Instructions" on the kind of answers which the Cossacks should give to the Tatars, should the latter ask for explanation, Weissbach advised them to reply in the following manner: "You have chosen Tatar protection as free men and of your own free will, not by constraint."<sup>20</sup> He was even more outspoken in another set of instructions: "As far as the place of your settlement is concerned . . . these places are your property, which you have ruled for several hundred years without encountering opposition from any quarters whatsoever; and no one, neither Russia nor the Porte [Turkey] nor the Crimean Khan nor anybody else, has the right to interfere in these territories directly belonging to you. . . . Since these territories are nobody else's concern, you

<sup>19</sup> Skal'kovski, *op. cit.*, II, 38-40, 44 f.; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, IV, 1324 f.; Evarnitski, *Istoriya . . .*, III, 552-560; P. P. Korolenko, "Materialy po istorii voiska zaporozhskago" [Materials Concerning the History of the Zaporozhian Host], *Sbornik khar'kovskago isto-filologicheskago obshchestva* [Collected Papers of the Kharkov Historical and Philological Society], 1897, IX, 140-142.

<sup>20</sup> Skal'kovski, *op. cit.*, III, Appendix No. 7, 289-293; D. I. Evarnitski, "Chislo i poryadok zaporozhskikh Sechei" [The Number and Sequence of the Zaporozhian Siches], *Kiyevskaya starina*, VIII, 1884, 603.

hope that you will be left to cultivate these lands peacefully, especially as no unfriendly action will be undertaken on your part towards Turkey or the Crimea. You, on the other hand, will defend and protect yourselves, with the last drop of your blood, on these lands of yours rightfully belonging of old to you.”<sup>21</sup>

Such was Weissbach's simple solution of this intricate problem. It must be said that this solution, undertaken in contravention of peace treaties, was very unsatisfactory. In the instructions to I. I. Neplyuyev, its minister resident in Constantinople (Tsar-gorod), the Russian government presented the affair of the Zaporozhian movement in quite a different light. Neplyuyev was to grant that the territory occupied by the Zaporozhians belonged to Turkey by the terms of the Pruth Treaty and to reply to a possible request for an explanation by the Porte by saying: “The Russian sovereigns did not invite them [the Cossacks].... Even if the Zaporozhians have moved from their former camp to the new one, it is of no concern to the Russian Empress, since it does not lie within Russian frontiers.” (Instructions of August 26, 1734.<sup>22</sup>) Such also was the interpretation of the Turks and the Tatars, and this very circumstance, namely, that the Zaporozhians living on Turkish territory declared themselves Russian subjects, aroused the special indignation of the Porte, which demanded that the Zaporozhians be transferred within the boundaries of the Russian Empire.<sup>23</sup>

On September 2, 1734, Camp Chief Malashevych arrived in Bila Tserkva (Belaya Tserkov), then Count Weissbach's headquarters, for final discussions of the conditions of the Cossacks' contemplated passage under Russian “protection.” He led a delegation consisting of 153 persons, in which both high ranking officer (*viys'kova starshyna*) and rank-and-file Cossacks were represented. Weissbach advised the Cossacks to evacuate the territories recently occupied by them, since they belonged to the Porte, and move within the boundaries of the Russian Empire,

<sup>21</sup> Skal'kovski, *op. cit.*, II, 63-65.

<sup>22</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki* ... II, 1148-1152; and *Istoriya* ..., II, 569-572.

<sup>23</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki* ..., II, 1184; and *Istoriya* ..., III, 572, 576.

so as not to violate the peace treaties with Porte. The Zaporozhians reply to this proposal was a rather characteristic note, from which their views on the rights to the territories seized by them may be clearly gathered. To counter a possible inquiry by the Porte they proposed that "the sovereignty over our former territory belongs to Her Majesty through us"; if asked why no previous mention was made of this interpretation, they intended to answer that "since we incurred the high displeasure of Her Imperial Majesty because of the crimes of our fathers, we did not need these territories, and we did not claim them as long as we were under Turkish protection; it was as if this land belonged to Turkey. Now, however, having obtained Her Imperial Majesty's gracious pardon for the crimes of our fathers, we have returned under our natural protector; therefore, this territory should truly follow with us. The Porte itself knows this, since these territories were not mentioned in the treaty on frontiers between Russia and the Porte." The Zaporozhians agreed to move nearer to the Russian frontiers and establish their camp between the rapids of the Dnepr and the Tyasmyn River, if necessary; however, they asked the Russian government for subsidies in this case.<sup>24</sup> This reply of the Zaporozhians contains a whole credo and expresses their firm and unswerving belief in their inalienable right to their "Free Lands," notwithstanding all treaties between Russia and Turkey.

A year later, in 1735, in a petition presented to Empress Anne, the Zaporozhian Host requested not to be forced to leave the newly occupied territories in case of a Turkish or Crimean protest: "These parts, where our camp is established, were not allotted to the Turks or the Tatars, since the frontier was drawn from that side on the bank of the Dnepr where once stood the town of Samar, from the Dnepr along Orel River to the Don; at the other point, beyond the Southern Bug River, the demarcation line runs from Ochakiv to Kodyma; whereas the place where we stay with our Host has not been demarcated, and in all the former and bygone years, for several centuries. . . . that our Host performed service for the Sovereigns of All Russia and the Polish

<sup>24</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki* . . . , II, 1159-1163.

Kings, nobody laid claim to or showed interest in this place on the Dnepr.”<sup>25</sup>

The subject of these negotiations has been dealt with at length, for they present a partial key to the understanding of those frictions and disagreements between the Zaporozhian Host and the Russian government which took place during the whole period of the existence of the last Zaporozhian Sich and which led to its destruction. Their basis was the Zaporozhians' firm conviction that their passing under the "protection" of the Russian government was not tantamount to their simply becoming Russian subjects but constituted a type of *commendation*. Both in 1709, when they accepted the protection of the Crimean Khan, and in 1734, when they came under that of Russia, the Zaporozhians were of the opinion that they were retaining their rights or "liberties": autonomy, their own jurisdiction, their right to collect taxes, and, above all, their right to be masters of the land, whatever the treaties between Russia and Turkey may have stipulated as to the sovereignty over it. "It is our territory," they maintained, "whether it passes to the sovereignty of the Crimea or of Russia." While staying at Oleshky, the Zaporozhians did not need or lay claim to this land, but, having moved to Bazavluk, they again entered into possession of it.<sup>26</sup>

It should be remarked that the question of rights to these territories did not particularly interest the Porte. In 1734 a Turkish emissary, Akhmet-Aga, arrived in the New Sich to determine on the spot whether the Zaporozhians were erecting fortifications there. Having found that there was nothing but living quarters (*kureni*) in the Sich, he said to the Zaporozhians that "since this border [land] belongs either to the Porte or to the Poles, the Zaporozhian Host settled on this frontier zone should not erect a fortress here. As to the ultimate disposition of the border [land], it will be discussed by the two monarchs, the Turkish and the Russian."<sup>27</sup>

Therefore, this party, whose rights on lands occupied by the

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1198-1201.

<sup>26</sup> Evarnitski, *Istoriya...*, III, 601 f.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 601 f.

Zaporozhians were in dispute, suddenly relinquished them and transferred the solution of this problem to the council of the monarchs. It is interesting that the Porte did not object when the Zaporozhians, stressing their loyalty to Russia, were once more hostile to the Turkish envoys who again visited the Sich in 1735.<sup>28</sup>

Thus a new Zaporozhian life started on their ancient territory. The frontiers of the Zaporozhian "Free Land" ran from Kryliv (later, Novo-Georgiyevsk) along the Dnepr to Perevolochna, thence along the Orel and the Donets to Bakhmut; from the Donets they followed the river Kalmius (Kal'mius) down to the Azov Sea, to the Berda; from Berda they ran to the mouth of Kins'ki Vody (Konskiye Vody), a confluent of the Dnepr, to arrive further at the Southern Bug *liman*. Then they ran up the Southern Bug to the Zaporozhian Hard, from there to the mouth of the Synyukha River, to join Kryliv again.

The Treaty of Belgrade (1739) and the "Instrument" of 1740 did not, at first, bring any *de facto* changes in the position of the Zaporozhians, although *de jure* the territory formerly acquired by Turkey according to the terms of the Pruth Treaty was secured by Russia again.<sup>29</sup> The boundaries of this territory ran from the mouth of the Kodyma River along the Bug to the Tashlyk; then the frontier ran "across the field," crossing the Harbuzyna and Mertvi Vody rivers to the old mosque on the Solona River, crossed the Yelanets' River, joined the old mosque on the Hromokleye River, followed the course of the Hromokleye to the Great Inhul River, passed the ford of Bekeneya, crossed the Little Inhul River, ran "across the field" to the mouth of the Kamyanka and then followed the Dnepr. The eastern frontier was defined by the "Instrument" in terms identical to those recorded in the demarcation document of 1706; the frontier ran from the mouth of Kins'ki Vody, opposite Kamynnyi Zaton, up the Konka River and then eastward in a direct line above the sources of the rivers Tokmak, Berdynka, Middle Berda, Extreme

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 604 f.

<sup>29</sup> *PSZ.*, No. 8276, November 4, 1740.



Berda to the Great Berda, which it followed to the Azov Sea.<sup>30</sup> The new "Instrument" of the year 1740 defined the eastern frontier more precisely. It was traced from the sources of the Konka to those of the Great Berda, from there to the newly founded city of Miusk (on the estuary of the Mius). In the north, the frontier followed the Donets and the Orel.<sup>31</sup>

For several years the Zaporozhians enjoyed all their "liberties," without any change in their juridical status. In 1744, however, the Polish government protested that, since it had not been represented at the demarcation negotiations between Russia and Turkey, the zone at the mouth of the Synyukha River belonging to Poland had been wrongly apportioned. As a result of this protest, a charter signed by Empress Elizabeth was despatched to the camp chief on December 15, 1744, which read, "As far as is known here, these places [i. e., the territories claimed by Poland] have belonged to the Zaporozhians since time immemorial, and they had their hunting and fishing grounds there; thus, our subjects, the Zaporozhian Cossacks, have been in possession of these places. The pertinent information concerning the boundaries is undoubtedly to be found in [the archives of] your Host." For this reason, the charter went on to say, a Captain Kolyubakin was being sent to Zaporizhzhya; the camp chief was to hand over to him written information concerning the Host's borders. Should there be no such information, he was to gather it from the recollections of the old settlers.<sup>32</sup> Replying to this request, the Zaporozhians submitted a detailed description of the boundaries in 1745, partly based on the indications of the older people but mainly making use of the charter of Stefan Batory. On the basis of this information, Russian, Polish and Zaporozhian commissioners traced a new Polish border.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Evarnitski, *Vol'nosti...*, p. 12.

<sup>31</sup> *Zapiski odesskago obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, II, 834.

<sup>32</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1718; P. Ivanov, "Materialy po istorii Zaporozh'ya XVIII st." [Material Concerning the History of Zaporizhzhya in the XVIIIth Century], *Zapiski Odes. obshchest. istor. i drevnost.*, XX, 83.

<sup>33</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1723 f. Skal'kovski, *op. cit.*, II, 118 f. publishes the same document with some changes.

In 1746, a dispute between the Zaporozhian and the Don Cossacks led to the establishment of the eastern boundary of the Zaporozhian possessions. During the absence of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, the Don Cossacks had begun to use the fishing grounds in the Azov Sea, as well as in the Berda and Kalmius rivers. When the Zaporozhians returned, they ousted them from these grounds. Empress Elizabeth ordered an investigation of the affair, and, after three years of surveying, a frontier was established between the Zaporozhian and the Don Cossacks. "The Zaporozhians are to rule over the rivers Samara, Volchi Vody (Volchiye Vody), Berda, Kalchyk (Kalchik), Kalmius, and their tributaries, sandbanks, ravines, and sundry appendages up to the former frontier of the year 1714." Henceforward the Kalmius and Kalka rivers were to divide the Zaporozhian from the Don Host.<sup>34</sup>

It will be instructive to examine a fact, or rather a series of facts, demonstrating the lack of concern of the Russian government toward the principles governing its assumption of sovereignty over the Zaporozhians. In 1750 Hetman Count K. Rozumovs'kyi asked the Senate under what conditions the Zaporozhians had become Russian subjects. The Senate replied that it did not know these conditions but that the College of Foreign Affairs should know them.<sup>35</sup> Unfortunately, the reply of the College has not come down to us, but it may be assumed that it was not better informed than the Senate. Indeed, in 1743, the College had answered a Senate inquiry—"Who has been responsible for them since their assumption of allegiance to Russia and who is responsible for them now?"—in the following way: "The decrees [concerning them] were despatched from the former Cabinet to General Weissbach and, later. . . to former Field Marshal General Münnich; . . . it is not known whose concern they are at present."<sup>36</sup>

Ambiguity and the lack of precise and clear policy towards the Zaporozhian Cossacks are characteristic of the attitude of the Russian government during the entire existence of the Zaporozhian Sich. This ambiguity made it necessary for the Rus-

<sup>34</sup> Skal'kovski, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-20.

<sup>35</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 173-176.

<sup>36</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki* . . . . ., II, 1714.

sian government to draw up a new solution of the problem of the Zaporozhians' land rights with every new misunderstanding. There were repeated attempts, accompanied by searches for deeds and charters, to establish rights valid "since time immemorial"; decisions were made, only to be ignored when later misunderstandings arose, and then the search for archival documents was repeated and interviews with "old people" had to be again conducted. This ambiguity shall be repeatedly referred to in the course of this work; suffice it to say here that the decade immediately preceding the destruction of the Sich (1764-1775) is especially characterized by frequent attempts to define these "rights."

## II. COLONIZATION OF THE "PLACES BEYOND THE DNEPR" AND THE "UKRAINIAN LINE"

We have already pointed out that the population of the Southern Ukraine was not limited to the Zaporozhian Cossack Host living in the Sich. For a long time, the "Free Lands" had had a settled population, established in farmsteads, winter quarters, and privileged settlements. These people were engaged in agriculture, stockbreeding, fishing, apiculture, and hunting. The number of settlers increased as the socio-economic conditions in the Left—and Right—Bank Ukraine deteriorated, and as the desire of the mass of the people grew to escape the oppression of the landlords, foreign and native. True enough, the menace of intermittent Tatar raids was present, but this was only a temporary danger; in the north there were neither dark forests nor steppes to provide shelter from the increasingly heavy yoke of serfdom. Thus, when the Tatars quieted down, people from different localities of the Ukraine penetrated into the steppe, in spite of guards and frontiers. Coming mainly from the Left-Bank Ukraine, they crossed the Dnepr near Kremenchuk (Kremenchug) and hid in the forests bordering the rivers Tsybul'nyk and Tyasmyn. Here, then, were the places where the first settlers of this region established

themselves.<sup>37</sup> Generally speaking, the northern parts of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" were populated more thickly than the southern. Already in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries there were not only farms but large villages and settlements in the north.

However, it is not easy to establish the time in which these villages were founded. This can be done only when precise documentary data concerning these villages are available. Thus, it is known that Kodak, Samar, Monastyryshche,<sup>38</sup> and Zvonets'ka Balka<sup>39</sup> existed already in the sixteenth century. More settlements are mentioned in the seventeenth century, such as Romaniv Yar, Troynyt's'ke, Zhovte, Orlivshchyna, Kuz'myn Yar, Chaplyne, Spas'ke, Yasenuvate, Lozovi Yar, Zalizna and others.<sup>40</sup> In some cases, seventeenth century data allow us to trace the origin of the settlers: thus, the settlement Plakhtii'vka and the locality Varvaryna Balka were settled by emigrants from Volhynia;<sup>41</sup> Voronivka was colonized by people coming from the Poltava region.<sup>42</sup>

The villages and settlements appearing in the beginning of the eighteenth century are too numerous to be mentioned here. Much material on this question has been collected by Bishop Feodosii (Theodosius) in his *Materialy dlya istoriko-statisticheskogo opisaniya Yekaterinoslavskoi eparkhii* [Material for

<sup>37</sup> *Materialy dlya otsenki zemel' Khersonskoi gubernii* [Material for the Assessment of Lands of the Kherson Government], III, *Aleksandriiski uezd* [The Aleksandriya District], 118.

<sup>38</sup> Feodosii, *Istoricheski obzor pravoslavnoi khristianskoi tserkvi v predelakh nyeshnei Yekaterinoslavskoi gubernii do vremeni formal'nago otkrytiya yeya* [Historical Survey of the Orthodox Christian Church within the Boundaries of the Present Ekaterinoslav Government, Prior to the Government's Official Establishment], Ekaterinoslav, 1876, p. 28.

<sup>39</sup> D. I. Evarnitski, *Vol'nosti...*, p. 169.

<sup>40</sup> Feodosii, *Materialy dlya istoriko-statisticheskago opisaniya Yekaterinoslavskoi yeparkhii* [Material for an Historical and Statistical Description of the Yekaterinoslav Diocese], Yekaterinoslav 1880, I, 12, 205, 242, 382, 259, 418, 435; II, 38; I, 539; II, 60, respectively.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 281; Evarnitski, *Vol'nosti...*, p. 186.

<sup>42</sup> Feodosii, *Materialy...*, I, 205.

an Historical-Statistical Description of the Yekaterinoslav Diocese], quoted repeatedly in this work. In this publication, based on church archives, the author has often been able to present precise information on the founding date of a given settlement or on the date it was first mentioned in the documents. From the manuscript material collected by O. M. Lazarevs'kyi it appears that a large number of lots, pasture grounds, and apiaries situated along the rivers Omel'nyk, Inhulets and in the neighborhood of the villages of Borodaivka, Kalyuzhna, and Buyaniv, were sold towards the end of the seventeenth century, since their titledeeds date from the years 1684, 1691 and 1692 respectively.<sup>43</sup>

When the Camp of the Zaporozhians moved to Oleshky, the "Free Lands" were by no means abandoned. The testimony of Koval'chuk, a Cossack of the Poltava regiment, is highly interesting in this respect. In 1728, he testified that several thousand Cossacks were then encamped on the banks of the Southern Bug, Isunya, Inhul, Bazavluk, Great and Little Kamyanka, Sura, Saksahan', Samara, Protovcha and other rivers. Koval'chuk surmised that "many thousands of people, whose exact number cannot be established" lived there, while in Oleshky, he claims, there were no more than fifteen hundred people.<sup>44</sup> The relationship between the Zaporozhians who moved to Oleshky and those who remained in the "Free Land," has already been pointed out. According to Myshetski's indications, there were Zaporozhian winter quarters between Perevolochna and the Southern Bug River at that time. Of course, figures for the population of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" can not be even approximately established, but there is reason to believe that at no time were they completely abandoned.

<sup>43</sup> Biblioteka Ukrains'koi Akademii Nauk [Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences], Rukopysnyi viddil [Manuscript Division], *Zbirka O. M. Lazarevskoho*, [Collection of O. M. Lazarev'kyi], No. 63.

<sup>44</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1138; and *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kozakov*, III, 542-544.

While the Zaporozhian Camp was in Oleshky and, later, on the Kamyanka banks, the number of people who had come from the Left-Bank Ukraine to settle along the rivers Tyasmyn, Inhulets' and Omel'nyk increased considerably. From 1710 on, especially in the twenties, in the absence of the former owners, a wildcat colonization of these regions began. This was carried out mainly by the Cossacks of the Myrhorod (Mirgorod) regiment, belonging to the Horodyshche, Vlasivka, Kremenchuk and Potik *sotni* (subdivision's of a regiment, sg. *sotnya*), whose areas bordered on these lands.<sup>45</sup> The most attractive factor was the forests. Suffering from a lack of wood at home, people first came to these places for lumber, then gradually began to settle down. Most of the free lots were claimed by squatters' rights, but title deeds appeared simultaneously and grew in number every year.<sup>46</sup> These interesting facts attest to the population increase in the area of the Tyasmyn and Inhul rivers and prove the existence of *de jure*, as well as *de facto*, owners of the land.

In the same period Poland attempted to seize the zone which, according to the Treaty of 1686, was to remain uninhabited and also the Zaporozhian lands occupied by the settlers from the Left-Bank regiments. In 1728 Hetman Danylo Apostol, having received a number of complaints from the officers (*starshyna*) of the Myrhorod regiment, sent a clear and detailed report on this subject to State Chancellor Count Golovkin. In it, the Hetman complained that the Poles were seizing the lands, which "by force of the Treaty of Eternal Peace" were to remain "uninhabited," and the arable land, the forests, apiaries, etc. They also required payment of the "bee-tithe" from the inhabitants of these regions.<sup>47</sup> Since these

<sup>45</sup> A. A. Andriyevski, "Materialy..." *op. cit.*, pp. 6-8; see also *Chteniya...*, 1847, No. 6, *Miscellanea* II.

<sup>46</sup> Bibl. Akad. Nauk, *Zbirka O. M. Lazarevskoho*, No. 63; and *Kopii dokumentov XVIII st.* [Copies of Documents of the XVIIIth Century], 1681 in the Manuscript Division of the library.

<sup>47</sup> *Kopii dokumentov XVIII st.*, 1965 (for the year 1743), No. 134/1859, sheets 941-945.

territorial disputes with the Poles were gradually becoming more embittered, a commission was created in 1732, with General von Stoffeln (Shtofel'n) presiding and with the participation of the colonel of the Hadyach regiment, Hrab'yanka, and the ranking officers of the Myrhorod regiment. The commission was to inspect the Polish frontier and "restore the places and lands, seized and colonized by the Poles, who had once again crossed the frontier, to the high rule of Her Imperial Majesty." The border was established along the Tyasmyn River and its tributary, the Irkley, running between the Motronyn and Chuta forests farther on to the Kruhlyi Bayrak (Round Ravine) and the Chornyi Lis (Black Forest). The commission gathered all the maps of the area then in existence, made inquiries among old inhabitants, and compiled a detailed description of all the localities seized by the Poles. It appears from this list that the Poles had seized thirteen inhabited localities and established ten additional settlements during the period of their rule. Among the settlements temporarily occupied by the Poles were Kryliv, Kolontaïvka, and Tsybuliv and the villages Andrusivka, Nesterivka, and Kryukiv. Over the weak protests of the Polish government, this territory was returned to Russia. In the decree of the General Military Chancery to Colonel Kapnist of Myrhorod, it was declared that "General von Stoffeln and the Little Russian nobility took [these territories] away from the Poles, under whose rule they then were, and restored them to their previous status, the rule of Russia."<sup>48</sup>

Thus, the colonizing activity displayed by the Myrhorod and Poltava regiments, and by the Polish nobility, resulted in a fairly dense population in the northern part of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" at the time the Zaporozhians were returning from their Crimean domains. The most northerly of these settlements, e. g., Kryliv, Pokhodiïvka, Orobiïvka, Nesterivka, Stetsivka, Andrusivka, Kolontaïvka, Voytove, Tsybuliv, Hlyns'k, Tonkonohivka, Bykhivka, and Kovalivka, were colonized by

<sup>48</sup> Andriyevski, "Materialy..." *op. cit.*, p. 59.

emigrants from the Myrhorod regiment and were subject to the colonel of that regiment. Settlements situated more to the south, e.g., Myshuryn Rih, Kamyanka, Plakhtiivka, Deriivka, Oboyans'k, and Kaluzhyno, were under the jurisdiction of the Poltava regiment for similar reasons.<sup>49</sup> O. O. Rusov also points to extraneous elements in the population; thus he demonstrates that the settlements of Plos'ka and Znamenka were founded by Russian Old Believers during the absence of the Zaporozhians.<sup>50</sup> However, in the period under discussion there were few such settlers. The bulk of the population consisted of emigrants from Left- and Right-Bank Ukraine, Cossacks, *pospolyti* (common peasants), and nobility, who began to acquire farmsteads and settlements by various means at that time. It has already been pointed out that in 1728 the officers of the Myrhorod regiment complained about the Poles seizing their lands; both Colonel Kapnist and Hetman Danylo Apostol possessed a large number of hamlets and mills there.<sup>51</sup>

The return of the Zaporozhians in 1734 did not, at first, influence the colonization of the northern frontier of the "Free Lands." The Zaporozhians did not need these lands and showed little interest in the question of their theoretical rights to them. This problem seemed more important to later researchers, some of whom give a quite precise definition of the legal status of the lands situated beyond the Dnepr. Thus, according to O. O. Rusov, while the Zaporozhians, to whom the lands to the south of the Tyasmyn River belonged, lived on the Crimean territory (in Oleshky), their "Free Lands" were left without owners; consequently, the settlements founded there were under the jurisdiction of the hetman.<sup>52</sup> A recent scholar, M. Tkachenko, characterized this situation in more precise terms: "These lands belonged to the Zaporozhian Sich... being simul-

<sup>49</sup> *Kopii dokumentov XVIII st.*, 1965; from the *Knigi Prav. senata po Malor. Eksped.* [Books of the Ukrainian Department of the Governing Senate], 1742, No. 123/1859.

<sup>50</sup> *Materialy dlya otsenki zemel' Khersonskoi gubernii*, III, 119, 118-119, 213.

<sup>51</sup> *Kopii dokumentov XVIII st.*, 1681.

<sup>52</sup> *Materialy dlya otsenki zemel' Khersonskoi gubernii*, III, 118-119, 213.



taneously within the sphere of influence of the Poltava and the Myrhorod regiments.”<sup>53</sup> Thus, it may be concluded that the only implicit thing was that the settlers, who founded their settlements on Zaporozhian territories, were dependent upon the colonels of the Myrhorod and Poltava regiments. Indeed, when the war with Turkey began, this population was transferred to the other bank of the Dnepr: “The inhabitants of these places have been transferred to Little Russia, to be protected from enemy attacks.”<sup>54</sup>

It is to be noted that at this stage of their economic development the Zaporozhians showed little interest in the land. Both before and after their departure for the Tatar domains, settlements and farmsteads grew on the Zaporozhian “Free Lands” spontaneously. The Zaporozhians clearly expressed their attitude towards the land problem in 1734 when they wrote in their reply to Count Weissbach, concerning their relations with the Tatars who grazed their cattle on Zaporozhian pastures: “Enough land will be left for both us and the Tatars.”<sup>55</sup> Some time later (in 1751), when the Zaporozhians complained to Empress Elizabeth of the unlawful appropriation of their lands by the inhabitants of Stara Samara, they stressed once more that these people had been using Zaporozhians’ lands with the latter’s permission for a long time: “They felled trees, mowed hay, caught fish, tilled the land without hindrance,” because “at that time nobody was interested in these places.”<sup>56</sup> This, however, was done with the Host’s knowledge and permission. What the Host wanted to know was not how large the area occupied by settlers was, but whether these settlers acknowledged its (the Host’s) sovereignty and whether they agreed to pay taxes and to fulfill duties which it might want to impose upon its subjects.

Intensive colonization of the Zaporozhian “Free Lands” began

<sup>53</sup> M. Tkachenko, “Utvorenniya Novoi Serbi:” [Establishment of New Serbia], *Ukrayina*, 1926, No. 2-3, p. 132.

<sup>54</sup> Andriyevski, “Materialy...,” *op. cit.*, p. 59.

<sup>55</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1160.

<sup>56</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov dya istorii zaporozhskikh kozakov* [Collection of Materials for the History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks], St. Petersburg, 1888, pp. 47-48.

at the very time when the Zaporozhians returned and established themselves on the Pidpil'na River. This phenomenon can be explained in many ways. The Treaty of Belgrade and the "Instrument" of 1740, by the terms of which Russia came into possession of a considerable part of the Southern Ukraine, had a most favourable effect on the increase of this movement and the growth of settlement there. The war with Poland and the presence of Russian armies on Polish territory enabled the Russian government to have refugees from the Left-Bank Ukraine and Russia proper, who had fled to the Right-Bank, return to their homes. The commanders of the Russian army were given secret orders to look out for refugees from Russia and take them back home.<sup>57</sup> By a series of decrees, permission was given to those who wished to return from Poland and settle in the "places beyond the Dnepr."<sup>58</sup>

Later, in 1741 and 1744, came new decrees, granting the refugees willing to return from Poland permission to settle in the "places beyond the Dnepr."<sup>59</sup>

In this respect the evidence provided by the *haydamaky*, (Ukrainian irregulars who fought the Poles) is interesting, since it attests to the growth of the colonizing movement in the forties: "Voytenko, a Tsybuliv inhabitant, testified that he came to this locality from the Lubny regiment in 1740: 'When the settlement of the places beyond the Dnepr began, my father, my brothers, and I came to live in Tsybuliv.'<sup>60</sup>

Settlers from the Left-Bank Ukraine and Poland arrived sometimes on their own, and sometimes through the mediation of a recruiting agent (*osadchyi*, i. e., a settlement organizer). The latter recruited those willing to settle, organized villages and settlements and assumed the role of intermediary between the settlers and the administration. The material published by A. A.

<sup>57</sup> M. I. Lilejev, *Iz istorii raskola na Vetke i v Starodub'ye XVII-XVIII vekov* [From the History of Dissent on the Vetka and in the Starodub Region of the 17-18th centuries], Kiev 1895, fasc. 1, p. 300.

<sup>58</sup> PSZ, No. 6555, March 16, 1734; No. 6612, August 2, 1734.

<sup>59</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1386-1387.

<sup>60</sup> *Arkhiv Yugo-Zapadnoi Rossii* [Archives of Southwest Russia], III, Part 3, 606.

Andriyevski contains striking examples illustrating the activity of these recruiting agents. In 1740 Colonel Tans'kyi appointed Leontyi Sahaydachnyi, a Cossack of the Myhorod regiment, recruiting agent and chief (*otaman*) of the village of Tsybuliv. Stepan Taran was similarly appointed in a settlement situated opposite the Polish Targowica (Ukrainian, Torhovvtsya). At this time they were instructed "to settle the villages with volunteers and not to get involved, or permit the inhabitants to get involved, in any litigations with the Poles living along the frontier; neither they, nor the inhabitants under their supervision, should have contacts with the *haydamaky* or give them shelter. Of these two, Chief Sahaydachnyi had already settled over 300 households with people from Poland and erected a church there; however, Chief Taran did not settle a single man opposite Torhovvtsya, for he is a beemaster, lives in the forest near his apiary and neither has made nor is making any effort to settle people." Therefore David Zvenyhorods'kyi, a Cossack of the Myrhorod regiment, approached the Governor General of Kiev, M. I. Leont'yev and asked him "to relieve the aforementioned beemaster Taran of his duties for neglect of the task with which he has been entrusted" and to charge Zvenyhorods'kyi himself with the task of colonizing this settlement. He had already convinced twenty families "coming to Little Russia from various places in Poland" to settle, and "they have declared their willingness to me to live there, only they fear the Poles, since there is no Russian garrison." Therefore Zvenyhorods'kyi asked for the establishment of a guard. The place was quite suitable for a settlement: "There is an abundance of forests, land, and sundry appendages; moreover, merchants going to the Sich and the Crimea from various places in Poland with wine, grain and other wares, take the road passing near the aforementioned Torhovvtsya."<sup>61</sup> It is in such a manner that Novo-Arkhangel's'k, an important trading post, came into being. The establishment of Davydivka-Petroostriv and other settlements proceeded along similar lines.<sup>62</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Andriyevski, "Materialy...," *op. cit.*, pp. 50-51.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 52-57.

It is difficult to establish precisely the increase in population and the number of new settlements. According to O. O. Rusov, whose figures apply only to the country (*povit*) of Aleksandriya (which did not encompass the whole territory of the "Free Lands" situated beyond the Dnepr), about forty settlements go back to Zaporozhian times.<sup>63</sup> The map by de Bosquet (de Bosket) made in 1745 shows about one hundred place names in the same area. Thus, about fifty per cent of all settlements came into existence either during the absence of the Zaporozhians or within the first decade after their return.

In the early forties of the eighteenth century the Myrhorod regiment attempted to secure the new settlements *de jure* for itself. In 1740 Kapnist, the colonel of this regiment, wrote a report to Field Marshal Münnich on the inclusion into the regiment area of the settlements "on the other bank of the Dnepr," situated on the rivers Tyasmyn and Irkley, and those lying along the upper Inhul down to the Vys' River. Kapnist declared that these places were populated by Cossacks and inhabitants of the Myrhorod regiment, who possessed titledeeds for their lands, pastures, apiaries and sundry appendages dating back to the time of "their fathers and forefathers." Other settlers occupied these places by ancient privileges. Since this application did not bring any results, Kapnist wrote another one in 1743, this time addressed to the Empress. He asked again for the inclusion of these settlements into the area of the Myrhorod regiment. He also requested permission to erect fortifications and to appoint *sotnyky* (commanders of *sotni*) from among the members of the chancery of the regiment.<sup>64</sup> In reply to this request, a Senate decree adjudicated the settlement of Kryliv "and others" to the Myrhorod regi-

<sup>63</sup> *Materialy dlya otsenki zemel' Khersonskoi gubernii*, III, 120.

<sup>64</sup> In his petition, Colonel Kapnist listed the following localities: Taboryshche, Konotop (referred to as a village), Svyarnya (a town), Zeletskivka, Laskivka, Kruzhiv, Omel'nychok, Berezivka, Pidsivka, Ruchky, (a town); the villages Shapovalivka, Lykhodiivka, Volkovachivka, Kurylivs'ke, Rosokhivka: the settlement of Kryliv; the villages Pokhodiivka, Orobitsivka, Andrusivka, Kalantaivka, Voytove, Stetsivka, Nesterivka, Tsybuliv, Tonkonohivka, Ukhivka, Byvivka, Kovalivka, Il'ins'ke. *Kopii dokumentov XVIII st.*, 1963; extract from the *Knigi prav. Senata po Malor. ekspeditsii*, 1743, No. 132/1859, p. 906.

ment, while Andrusivka, Myshuryn Rih and the settlements at the mouth of the Samara, those of Kaminnyi Ostriv and the Nenasytets' retrenchment were placed under the jurisdiction of the Poltava regiment.<sup>65</sup> The brief (*ekstrakt*) submitted by Colonel Kapnist to the Senate in 1746 specified that in the town of Kryliv and "the villages belonging to it" there were "259 Cossacks, 172 *pospolyti*, altogether, 431 people"; in the town of Tsybuliv with the appertaining villages "289 Cossacks, 123 *pospolyti*, altogether, 412 people"; and in the towns of Arkhangel's'k and Petroostriv "78 Cossacks, 227 *pospolyti*, altogether, 305 people; sum total 1,148 people."<sup>66</sup>

At first, the Zaporozhians paid little attention to the colonization of their "Free Lands." However, when the new administration of *sotnyky* and colonels began to appear in the area occupied by the recent settlers and when these territories, which previously had been ruled, even if nominally, by the Host, began to come under the control of foreign colonels, the Zaporozhians rose to the defense of their rights. Thus in 1744 they filed a complaint with the Governing Senate (*Pravitel'stvuyushchii Senat*) in which they proved their titles to these territories by documents, stipulations of the Treaty of 1686, etc. They complained of Colonel Kapnist, who had started appropriating their farmsteads, winter quarters and settlements of the right bank of the Dnepr: "His people have begun to infiltrate our 'Free Lands'... They have caused considerable harm to our Cossacks there... They started to pull down and burn the winter quarters and to take away the cattle." In his reply, Kapnist wrote that "he did not possess farms or apiaries along the lower course of the Little (Malyi) Inhulets which were unlawfully established on the appendages of the Zaporozhian Host, nor did he take any Zaporozhian possessions away from them, nor give any to Little Russians; in fact, no settlements or apiaries have been established on territories granted to the Zaporozhians." As for the settlements situated in the areas of Tsybuliv and Chornyi Lis and along the

<sup>65</sup> PSZ, No. 8813, October 30, 1743.

<sup>66</sup> *Kopii dokumentov XVIII st.*, No. 2014.

course of Little Inhulets, they belong to the Kryliv *sotnya* where "there have never been nor are there any Zaporozhian establishments." "The Cossacks of the Myrhorod regiment never commit any offenses against the Zaporozhians or pull down and burn their winter quarters. In fact, there would be nothing to burn, for the Zaporozhians, lurking in the steppe to thief, make their winter quarters out of willow and cover them with reeds to provide protection from rain; when they move to new places, these quarters are usually consumed by steppe fires."<sup>67</sup> From this statement it appears that Colonel Kapnist did not consider the Zaporozhian winter quarters worthy of attention; nevertheless, they were the most usual form of Zaporozhian settlements at that time. Replying to the complaints of the Zaporozhians in 1744, Empress Elizabeth issued a decree forbidding outsiders "to settle in the domains of the Zaporozhians and cause them any kind of harm or offense." But the same document stipulated that the Zaporozhians in their turn had no right to prohibit Colonel Kapnist from erecting fortifications on their territories. Indeed, at that very time fortifications were being built in Arkhangel's'k and Orel, along the Southern Bug and elsewhere.<sup>68</sup>

The decree of the year 1744 did not put an end to the struggle. On the contrary, it was only beginning and it was to assume increasingly bitter forms. The arguments advanced by the contending parties in the initial stage of the dispute were as follows: The Zaporozhians referred to the antiquity of their rule and their rights which were confirmed by the charter of Stefan Batory and the proclamation of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi. Kapnist maintained that the land belonged to the Myrhorod regiment, for it had been settled by the Cossacks and inhabitants from that regiment. The complaint against the Zaporozhians, filed by him in 1746, is especially interesting in this context. He wrote there that "the Zaporozhians, leaving the Sich out of pure lawlessness, roam

<sup>67</sup> Andriyevski, "Materialy. . . , *op. cit.*, pp. 86-87.

<sup>68</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki. . .*, II, 1396-1407; Andriyevski, "Materialy. . . , " *op. cit.*, Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 141.

along steppe rivers, such as the Great and Little Inhul, Saksahan', Suhakleya, Kamyshevata, Mertvi Vody, Kostovata, Hromokleya Yelanets', Bokova and others, and commit numerous offenses against the Cossacks and inhabitants of the Myrhorod regiment, dwelling in places beyond the Dnepr."<sup>69</sup> These rivers were unquestionably in possession of the Zaporozhian Host for a long time, since they flowed, so to speak, through the very heart of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands."

The struggle between the Zaporozhian Cossacks and the Poltava regiment for areas lying along the Samara River also began in the early forties. In 1741 the Senate permitted the colonization of lands beyond the Dnepr by emigrants from Poland; at the same time emigrants from the Left-Bank Ukraine began to settle at Ust' Samara, the redoubt of Byrkut, and Stara Samara. Since they came mostly from the area of the Poltava regiment, these settlements were attached to this regiment.<sup>70</sup> The Zaporozhian Camp started a bitter struggle for these localities, a struggle which was to be carried on with varying success. Thus, the decree of August 23, 1744, "forbade the inhabitants of Stara Samara to interfere with the Zaporozhian 'Free Lands'"; the town itself was returned to the Zaporozhians.<sup>71</sup> In 1746 another decree confirmed this prohibition; in 1748 the inhabitants of Stara Samara in their turn complained against the Zaporozhians who, they said, had usurped "their" lands and dependencies.<sup>72</sup> This state of affairs dragged on until 1756, when Empress Elizabeth, in her "gracious address," ordered the hetman to draw up a detailed list of Zaporozhian possessions in view of the continuous complaints by the latter against the usurpation of their lands, including the area of the Samara River. "This claim by the aforementioned Zaporozhian Host is very unjustified," the "address" stipulated, "and it is

<sup>69</sup> Andriyevski, "Materialy...", *op. cit.*, p. 77; Evarnitski, *Isochniki...*, II, 1730.

<sup>70</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1335-1337, 1363-1364, 1380.

<sup>71</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 1-7, 46-49, 51-54, 77-79, 132-139, 140-149; *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kozakov*, I, 28-30; *Vol'nosti...*, p. 13.

<sup>72</sup> *PSZ*, No. 8813, October 30, 1743.

very inadvisable to grant to the Zaporozhians all the lands which they mention in their writings [even] up to Perevolochna.”<sup>73</sup>

It has already been pointed out that not only Cossacks and *pospolyti* but also Ukrainian nobles were among those who had seized Zaporozhian lands along both banks of the Dnepr. The petition of 1728 already mentions farmsteads and settlements belonging to the *sotnyky* of the Myrhorod regiment, as well as the settlements of Hetman Apostol.<sup>74</sup> Their number grew with time. In 1744, a decree of the Senate referred to two charters of 1708 and 1710; the former granted Vorobtsivka to Lyzohub and the latter confirmed a similar grant of Horodyshche, Kryliv and the mills on the Tyasmyn to Colonel Apostol.<sup>75</sup> At the same time, Kochubey received huge estates along the Orel River.<sup>76</sup> In later years, the nobility continued to take possession of lands. In his explanatory letter of 1745, Colonel Kapnist stressed the fact that he did not possess “homesteads and apiaries of his own” on the lower Inhul, but he did not deny such possessions on the territory of the Kryliv *sotnya*.<sup>77</sup> A complaint, filed in 1747 by the recruiting agent David Zvenyhorods’kyi, stated clearly that Colonel Kapnist usurped all the places beyond the Dnepr for his personal use.<sup>78</sup> In 1763 Kapnist’s widow requested the Senate to allot “grounds” to her in recompense for those which had been taken away for inclusion into Nova Serbiya. Her request was not granted, for the homesteads included in Nova Serbiya had been founded “in spite of decrees forbidding it.”<sup>79</sup> It is probable that the

<sup>73</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki* . . . , II, 1343. During this struggle for the Samara lands, the Kiev Provincial Administration and the General Military Chancery dispatched figures to the Senate on the number of people living in the area of the Poltava regiment who had recently settled in Stara Samara: in 1742 there were 219 people and in 1744, 439. Evarnitski, *Istochniki* . . . , II, 1367; *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kozakov*, I, 31.

<sup>74</sup> *Kopii dokumentov XVIII st.*, No. 1681.

<sup>75</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 661-669.

<sup>76</sup> *Arkhiv Zaporoz’koi Sichi. Opys materiyaliv* [Archives of the Zaporozhian Sich. List of Materials], Kiev 1931, No. 149, p. 56.

<sup>77</sup> Andriyevski, “Materialy. . .,” *op. cit.*, p. 86.

<sup>78</sup> *Bibl. Akad. Nauk*, Manuscript Division, 2035-2039.

<sup>79</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 510-511.



brother of the hetman, Count O. Rozumovs'kyi, was granted estates in the vicinity of Tsybuliv about the same time. His homestead is mentioned in a document of 1750, which concerns a *haydamak* raid on Tsybuliv.<sup>80</sup>

The manner in which Brigadier Apochynin, commander of the Perevolochna fortress, usurped his estates, is characteristic of the form which the struggle for land took at that time. In 1743 the Zaporozhian Camp in a complaint to the Empress pointed out that Apochynin had founded a settlement on the spot called Trytuzne and Maydanshchyna and that he was felling the forest in which the Zaporozhians had their apiaries. The rescript of the Empress was highly favorable to the Zaporozhians. She forbade Apochynin to establish unauthorized settlements and ordered that settlements already founded were to be disbanded. The execution of this decree was entrusted to the Governor General of Kiev, M. I. Leont'yev, who gave the affair a different turn. He reported to the Senate that Apochynin had established his settlement not on the Zaporozhian land but on his own land, purchased from Varvara Fedorykha, an inhabitant of Perevolochna. One Ul'yanin, a captain in the Pskov regiment, was sent to clear up the affair on the spot and was unable to find "Trest'tsetnevo" (instead of Trytuzne). Apochynin must have taken the precaution of moving his settlers to the left bank of the Dnepr. Following this investigation, Apochynin not only incurred no losses, but even acquired new estates in Trytuzne, Avul, and near the Sokol's'k redoubt. The only losers in this revision were "the inhabitants from the regiments of Little Russia and Slobids'ka Ukraine who had settled without a decree," numbering 279 persons of both sexes, whom Uly'anin found in Vol'ne. He had them deported to "their former places," along with 41 persons of both sexes settled there who had come from Stara Samara.<sup>81</sup>

Simultaneously with the appropriation of the Zaporozhian lands by the neighboring Myrhorod and Poltava regiments, a southward movement of the line of fortifications, organized by

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 139.

<sup>81</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki*, II, 1214, 1296, 1299, 1365, 1388, 1707-1714.

the Russian government, and the settlements connected with them began.

While the Cossack camp was in Oleshky (1731), the construction of the "Ukrainian Line," (*Ukrains'ka Liniya*) which was to protect Slobids'ka Ukraine from Tatar incursions, was started on Zaporozhian territories. This line stretched from the Dnepr at Perevolochna to the Don.<sup>82</sup> Along the Line, "territorial militia" (*landmilit's'ki*) regiments were settled, made up mainly of freeholders (*odnodvorts'i*) recruited in the military districts (*rozryady*) of Sevsk and Bilhorod (Belgorod). The idea conceived by Count Weissbach of settling Old Believers had been abandoned.<sup>83</sup> The lands allotted to the "territorial militia" regiments as settlements were often situated in front of the Line.<sup>84</sup>

Since the Russian government strove to colonize the Line in the shortest possible time, fugitive freeholders, who had been seized in various other localities, were settled there. Russian peasants whom Menshikov and Prince Dolgoruki brought to the Ukraine and settled in Yampil, Klysh and Cheplivka were moved to these regions. Thus, fairly important Russian settlements came into existence there. As the conditions of life became more peaceful, these people were gradually joined by other settlers.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>82</sup> The following seventeen fortresses were built there: Borysohlibs'ka, Tsarychanka, Livens'ka, Vasyl'kivs'ka, Ryaz'ka, Kozlovs'ka, St. Fedora, Bilevs'ka, St. Ioanna (St. John), Orlivs'ka, St. Paraskevy (St. Parasceve), Yefremivs'ka, Oleksiyivs'ka, Slobids'ka, Mykhaylivs'ka, Tambovs'ka, Sv. Petra (St. Peter). They were 25 versts apart, so that the whole line was 400 versts in length (1 verst=0.6629 mile). D. I. Bagalei (Bagalii), *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii stepnoi Okrainy Moskovskogo gosudarstva* [Studies in the History of the Colonization of the Steppe Borderland of the Muscovite State], Moscow 1887, pp. 298, 304, 309. The author gives both the original and the later names of these fortresses (see p. 303).

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 318 Manshtein (C. H. von Manstein), *Zapiski Manshteina o Rossii 1727-1744* [Notes of Manstein on Russia 1727-1744], St. Petersburg 1875, IV, pp. 67-68; *PSZ*, No. 9106b February 1, 1745.

<sup>84</sup> Bagalei, *op. cit.*, pp. 330, 332; Laskovski, *Materialy dlya inzhenernago iskusstva v Rossii* [Material on the Art of Engineering in Russia], St. Petersburg, 1861-65, III, 701-702.

<sup>85</sup> Bagalei, *op. cit.*, pp. 332-33; *PSZ*, No. 8801, October 7, 1743; 9131 and 9132, March 29, 1745.

The establishment of the Ukrainian Line with its "territorial militia" regiments constituted a grave danger to the Zaporozhian "Free Lands," since the line of fortifications all but touched the Zaporozhian frontiers. This danger was somewhat alleviated by the fact that the new settlers, once having crossed the Zaporozhian frontiers, often recognized Zaporozhian sovereignty. Although their decision cost them their lands, such was the course adopted by many inhabitants of the small towns reserved for the settlement of the "territorial militia" regiments, e. g., Orlyk, Tsarychanka, Mayachka, Kytayhorod and others. They crossed over to the left bank of the Orel, built farms and started to raise cattle. In 1754 the colonel of the Poltava regiment requested the hetman to order their return to their previous holdings, for, having crossed the Line, they ceased to fulfill their duties. The hetman issued a proclamation enjoining those who had left to move back to the right bank of the Orel, i. e., behind the Line. They did not show any desire to return, however, and approached the Cossack Camp and asked that they be received as subjects. The Camp did so readily, and their new settlements and farmsteads were the nucleus of a new Zaporozhian district (*palanka*) that of Orel, to which the lands between the Orel and Samara were attached, along with the villages of Kozyrshchyna, Pushkarivka, Hupalivka, Pereshchepyna, Mohyliv and others.<sup>86</sup>

It was even more difficult for the Zaporozhians to become reconciled to the existence of the New Sich entrenchment, founded in 1735 in the very heart of their domains and permanently garrisoned by a detachment of the Russian army, under the chief command of the Governor General of Kiev. In 1739 the latter was given the task of "keeping a watchful eye on the frontier outposts, to enforce the observance of the quarantine and to keep an eye on the various people passing through these outposts on foot or in wagons." He also had to "ascertain the plans and movements of the Turks and the Tatars."<sup>87</sup> These instructions left

<sup>86</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 262-263.

<sup>87</sup> Andriyevski, "Materialy..." *op. cit.*, pp. 123-25, 139; Kiyevskii tsentral'nyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (KTsADA), [Kiev Central Archive of Ancient Acts] *Fond kievskoi gubernskoi kantselyarii* [Depository of the Kiev Provincial Chancery], 9133.

ample opportunity for continuous interference with Zaporozhian affairs and for the maintenance of small garrisons of the Russian army in the steppe.<sup>88</sup> Gradually a network of outposts was formed, subject to the Governor General of Kiev, bordering on Zaporozhian territories and occasionally extending even beyond them. It comprised the outposts and redoubts in Perevolochna, Nikityn, Ust' Samara, Byrkut, Sokol's'k, and elsewhere.<sup>89</sup>

In 1743 the government resolved to broaden the line of fortification and move it deeper into the steppe. The task of inspecting the territory and selecting points suitable for the erection of fortifications was given to a colonel of the Corps of Engineers, de Bosquet. On this trip to the Southern Ukraine de Bosquet was accompanied by Colonel Kapnist. The Zaporozhians were greatly disturbed by this mission and put all sorts of obstacles in de Bosquet's way.<sup>90</sup> Points for future fortifications were fixed in Kryliv, Arkhangel's'k and Orel on the Southern Bug.<sup>91</sup>

De Bosquet's expedition proved to be of cardinal importance for the exploration of the region. He not only drew a detailed map of the area, but also provided the Senate with demographic data, which were referred to for a long time to come.

In 1746 an order was issued to station six "territorial militia" regiments on the frontier of the Ukraine. A belt extending 40 versts towards the *Het'manshchyna* (territory rul-

<sup>88</sup> Andriyevski, *Istoricheskiye materialy izvlechennyye iz arkhiva kiyevskogo gubernskogo pravleniya* [Historical Materials Abstracted from the archive of the Kiev Provincial Administration], Kiev 1885, fasc. 8, p. 76; V. I. Shcherbina, "Kiyevskyye voyevody, gubernatory i general-gubernatory" [Voivode, Governors and Governor-Generals of Kiev], *Chteniya v istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora Letopistsy* [Readings in the Historical Society of Nestor the Annalist], IV, Kiev, 1892, 134, 147-148.

<sup>89</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov...*, pp. 91-124; *passim* Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 89.

<sup>90</sup> Andriyevski, "Materialy. . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 77-90.

<sup>91</sup> A. Schmidt, *Materialy dlya statisticheskogo opisaniya Rossiiskoi imperii, khersonskaya guberniya* [Material for a Statistical Description of the Russian Empire, the Kherson Province], St. Petersburg 1863, I, 23; *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 77, 406, 425.

ed by the hetman) and stretching 30 versts southwards in the direction of the Zaporozhian territories, was assigned to these regiments. The Senate attributed great importance to the organization of these regiments, for in this manner it hoped to solve the intricate problem of protecting the southern border from incursions. Colonization by "militia" regiments, which combined military garrisons with agricultural settlements, has often been the most efficient as well as the most economic means of defending frontiers. These regiments were allotted pasture grounds along the Orel River, in other words in the very places especially cherished by the Zaporozhians, a circumstance which again led to protracted litigations. Once more the Zaporozhians set to writing complaints, bringing forward the charter of Stefan Batory and the proclamation of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, together with the charters of Empress Elizabeth. The Senate refused to recognize the rights of the Zaporozhians, whose case was based on copies of these documents, and required that the originals be produced. The Zaporozhians were not able to do this, since the original documents had been destroyed in 1709 during the attack on the Sich.<sup>92</sup>

Meanwhile, the number of regiments stationed on Zaporozhian territory continued to increase. In 1750, a seven hundred-man detachment of a "territorial militia" regiment was dispatched to Novoarkhangel's'k in connection with the *haydamak* movement. Contingents of soldiers, between five hundred and six hundred-men strong, were stationed in various places.<sup>93</sup> Detachments of "Little Russian Cossacks," who had been moved there to combat the *haydamaky*, garrisoned the outposts and should also be added to these troops.

Thus, during the forties of the eighteenth century the northern part of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" ceased being within the Zaporozhians' sphere of influence and was virtually lost to them. This territory was ruled by the hetman through the colonels of the Myrhorod and Poltava regiments. Here, there were settle-

<sup>92</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov* . . . , pp. 77-79.

<sup>93</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 100, 101, 240.

ments with local officers: *sotnyky* (captains), *osauly* (adjutants), *otomany* (chiefs) and great landowners were laying the cornerstone for their future latifundia. Finally, outposts, redoubts and fortresses were built here with their garrisons, by the orders of the Governor General of Kiev, the sole (Russian) military commander in the Southern Ukraine.

All this was the background for the later developments. The land question was becoming particularly acute; after their return from the Tatar "protectorate," the Zaporozhians began to show much more interest in their lands and to establish settlements. Moreover, about the same time great estates owned by the nobility and dependent for the most part on hired laborers, servants and *pospolyti*, began to appear in these territories.

In the meantime, the northern parts of the "Free Lands" which, because of their security from Tatar incursions and for climatic reasons, were best suited for agriculture, slipped from under the control of the Zaporozhian Host. Fleeing the oppression of the nobility and the landlords, people from all corners of the Ukraine—the "Polish" territories and those areas ruled by the hetmans—gathered in these newly established settlements of Cossacks, *pospolyti*, or nobility. However, they found the same socio-economic conditions as those from which they had fled, for here, too, serfdom had begun to strike roots. Nevertheless, the burden was not so oppressive in the beginning, and people were lured by the exemptions (*svobody*) from obligations for a fixed number of years. Simultaneously, a part of the population of the new settlements began to move even farther south, into the Zaporozhian domains, where the exemptions were more extensive and where it was easier to withdraw into the steppe. It has been pointed out previously that the habitants of Mayachka, Rayhorodok, Tsarychanka and Orlyk moved into Zaporozhian territories and declared themselves subjects of the Zaporozhian Host. The same phenomenon occurred at other places. Thus, the officers of Stara Samara, headed by *sotnyk* Zub, complained to the colonel of the Poltava regiment, Horlenko (who forwarded the complaint to the General Military Chancery, which in turn sent it to the Senate) that over half of the inhabitants of the Stara Samara

*sotnya* had left for Zaporozhian territories, such as Kodak and the banks of the rivers Kil'chen', Dnepr and Samara, and that they were paying no taxes, for "the Zaporozhians hold them under their jurisdiction and protect them from taxation."<sup>94</sup> However, a reverse phenomenon should also be recorded: a number of people moved from the Zaporozhian territories and settled in Stara Samara and other settlements.<sup>95</sup> In spite of oppressive measures which forced people to seek refuge in the steppe, the northern part of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands," comprising the zone south of the river Tyasmyn, began to increase rapidly in population and wealth. In the forties of the eighteenth century, a number of settlements became economic and commercial centers of some importance. There was Domotkan' with its fair "on St. Michael's Day" and its cattle market, attracting buyers from Zaporizhzhya and Kiev; there were Kryliv and Novoarkhangel'sk, situated on trade routes linking the Crimea and Zaporizhzhya with Poland and other localities.<sup>96</sup>

In concluding this chapter on the colonization of the territories beyond the Dnepr in the first half of the eighteenth century it is necessary to stress one feature of this process. Settlements, little towns, and homesteads were founded spontaneously, without the participation of the government. People coming here from *Het'manshchyna*, Right-Bank Ukraine, and Zaporizhzhya did so on their own initiative. Whether they took over free acres, bought land from earlier settlers, or seized it by force, they did it independently. Neither the Zaporozhian Camp nor the Russian government interfered. The latter simply sanctioned the *faits accomplis*, gave its protection to the new settlers, and intervened, rather casually, in disputes between them and the Zaporozhians. But it acted *ad hoc*, deciding in favor of one side or the other, without ever providing a fundamental solution to the problem.

<sup>94</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki* . . . , II, 1664-1666.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 1343-1344.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*; Feodosi, *Materialy* . . . , I, 275; Andriyevski, "Materialy . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 51, 54.

### III. RECRUITMENT OF FOREIGN COLONISTS AND THE PLAN TO ESTABLISH MILITARY SETTLEMENTS IN NOVA SERBIYA AND SLAVYANOSERBIYA

The systematic colonization of the territories beyond the Dnepr began in the second half of the eighteenth century. The movement started with the creation of settlements of foreign colonists, called Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya.

The arrival of foreigners, especially Orthodox co-religionists of Slavic origin, was no novelty to the Ukraine. A number of Serbs had served in the Ukrainian army as early as the seventeenth century; many Slavs had come to the Kiev Academy to study.<sup>97</sup> In the beginning of the eighteenth century this influx increased; under Peter I, a special detachment of Serbian emigrants was organized under Major Ivan Albanos, who had brought these emigrants to Russia. Later, during the Russo-Turkish War, this detachment was reorganized and transformed into a Serbian Hussar regiment, the so-called "Old Regiment."<sup>98</sup>

During the Great Northern War (1700-1721) a considerable number of Moldavians served in the Russian army.<sup>99</sup> In 1733, in carrying out Count Weissbach's proposal to enlist foreigners in the army, Serbians, Hungarians, Slovaks, Macedonians and Bosnians had been summoned from abroad. The Hungarian and

<sup>97</sup> N. P. Dashkevich, *Obshcheniye Yuzhnoi Rusi s yugo-slavyanami*, [Contacts of Southern Russia with Southern Slavs], pp. 127-128; Vlodimir Hnatyuk, "Znosyny ukrainsiv iz serbami" [Relations of Ukrainians with Serbs], *Naukovyi zbirnyk prysvyachenyi profesorovi M. Hrushevs'komu* [Scholarly essays Dedicated to Professor Hrushevs'ky], Lvov 1906, p. 388; I. Kryp'yakevych, "Serby v ukrains'komu viys'ku" [Serbs in the Ukrainian Army], *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovyarstva Imeny Shevchenka* [Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society], L'vov, 1920, 81-93.

<sup>98</sup> KTsADA, *Fond kiyevskoi gubernskoi kantselyarii*, Nos. 5290, 6795, 12529 (old list); A. A. Skal'kovski, *Khronologicheskoye obozreniye istorii Novorossiiskago kraya* [Chronological Survey of the History of New Russia], I, 15-16; N. Popov, ed., "Izvestiye o pokhozhenii Simeona Stepanova syna Pishchevicha," [Account of the Adventures of Simeon, Son of Stephen Pishchevich], *Chteniya moskovskago obshchestva itsorii i drevnostei.*, 1881, p. 198.

<sup>99</sup> N. L. Yunakov, *op. cit.*, III, 60-61.



Moldavian regiments, formed from these recruits, were stationed in the Ukraine.<sup>100</sup>

Along with these transfers *en masse*, the migration of individual Serbs, Slovenes and Montenegrins into the Ukraine continued throughout the eighteenth century. Many of them joined the Ukrainian military nobility, becoming *sotnyky* and sometimes even colonels. Often they acquired considerable riches and estates and founded wealthy families who obtained a position of eminence among the Ukrainian nobility. The families of Myloradovych, Bozhych, Raich-Dmytrashko, Trebysn'kyi, Perych, Vytkovych, and others were founded in this manner.<sup>101</sup>

These facts prove that the way to the Ukraine was well known in the eighteenth century. The example of the new arrivals showed how easy it was to acquire great wealth and make a brilliant career in these rich territories.

Up to the middle of the eighteenth century, the immigration from abroad did not acquire a mass character and did not substantially influence the life of the Ukraine; however, in 1751, the situation changed.

Towards the end of the seventeenth century, an important group of Serbs had left Turkey and migrated to Austria. They met with a friendly reception and were given lands in the valleys of the Tisa, the Marosh, the Danube, and the Sava, on the condition that they would organize "militia" regiments and build entrenchments. While performing this frontier service, the Serbs retained all their national customs and organizations. They helped Austria considerably in its struggle with Turkey and assisted

100 PSZ, No. 6062, May 19, 1732; No. 6743, September 3, 1733; KTsADA, *Fond kiyevskoi gub. kantsel.*, No. 14874 (old listing); A. Skal'kovski, *Opyt statisticheskago opisaniya Novorossiiskago kraya* [Essay of a Statistical Description of New Russia], Odessa 1850, 233.

101 Bantysh-Kamenski, *Istoriya Maloi Rossii* III, 50; A. M. Lazarevski, "Lyudi staroi Malorossii" [People of Old Little Russia], *Kiyevskaya starina*, 1882, I, 479 ff.; cf. also A. M. Lazarevski, "Istoricheskiye ocherki Poltavskoi Lubenshchiny" [Historical Sketches of the Poltava-Lubny Area], *Chteniya v istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa*, 1896, XI, 34-203; V. A. Myakotin, "Ocherki sotsial'noi istorii Malorossii" [Sketches of the Social History of Little Russia], *Russkiye zapiski*, July 1915, pp. 134-135.

it in putting down the Hungarian insurrection. In the forties of the eighteenth century, Hungarians, who at that time began to play a prominent part at the court of Maria Theresa, obtained from the Empress the transfer of the Serbian settlements to Hungarian rule. For the Serbs this meant a period of varying persecutions. They were asked to exchange their possessions for less profitable ones; those who refused to become Hungarian subjects had to move to Sirmia, where there were no free lands; those who refused to leave lost all their privileges.<sup>102</sup>

In this difficult situation the Serbs turned for help to Russia, which they had long considered a land of promise. In 1751 the Russian ambassador at Vienna, Count M. P. Bestuzhev-Ryumin, received a visit from representatives of the Serbian nobility, Ivan Samoylovich Khorvat from Kurtich, his brother Dmitri, and Nicholas and Theodore Chorba. They proposed to organize a large-scale transfer of Serbs into the Ukraine under the following conditions: The Russian government would allot them lands near Baturyn for the purpose of colonization, and Khorvat would settle two regiments there, consisting exclusively of Serbs, Macedonians, Albanians and other "Orthodox" peoples, three thousand men in all. He himself was ready to defray the costs of the journey, the equipment and the horses. For this service he requested the hereditary rank of colonel of a Hussar regiment.<sup>103</sup>

Notifying the Russian government of this proposal, Bestuzhev-Ryumin advised its acceptance but with some qualifications. The Serbians, he wrote, should be granted lands not in the Baturyn area, but somewhere on the frontier; moreover, the settlement conditions should be the same as those under which they lived in Austria. The Serbians should be organized into a frontier militia and given building materials and means of subsistence

<sup>102</sup> Nil Popov, "Voyennye poseleniya serbov v Austrii i Rossii" [Military Settlements of Serbians in Austria and Russia], *Vestnik Yevropy*, 1870, VI, 589-96; Skal'kovski, *Khronologi obozr.* . . , I, 19; S. Solov'yev, *Istoriya Rossii*, Book V, p. 711; N. Popov, ed., "Izvestiye. . ." *op. cit.*, p. 85.

<sup>103</sup> Popov, "Voyennye poseleniya. . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 598, 605; S. Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, pp. 711-712.

for one year. After that time they should be left without government subsidies, to "gain their livelihood on their own."<sup>104</sup>

Khorvat's proposal met with sympathy in St. Petersburg. On July 11, 1751, Bestuzhev-Ryumin was empowered to open official negotiations with the Austrian government on the resettlement of the Serbs in Russia.<sup>105</sup> Another order, dated July 13, 1751, instructed Bestuzhev-Ryumin to inform Khorvat that he had been granted Russian nationality. Simultaneously, he was to be told that "all those of the Serbian nation who are desirous of moving into the Russian Empire will be accepted as subjects, inasmuch as they are Orthodox."<sup>106</sup>

Khorvat's proposal suited the plans of the Russian government, which sought by all possible means, but at the least possible cost, to secure the frontier of the Empire against Turkish and Tatar incursions. It was with this purpose in mind that twenty years earlier the government had granted Weissbach's request to permit the return of the Zaporozhians and had later ordered the construction of fortified lines and the establishment of "territorial militia" regiments. Soon after the return of the Zaporozhians, it became obvious that they could not enjoy the government's confidence, reluctant as they were to participate in the suppression of the *haydamak* movement, so that the necessity arose of increasing the number of outposts along the Zaporozhian frontier. This time it seemed that adequate protection of the frontiers could be provided by people who offered their services unasked, and who, in the opinion of the Russian government, however unwarranted, were noted for their military experience. It was natural, therefore, that Khorvat's proposal should be favorably received by the Russian government which decided to employ the military power of the Serbs not to defend Baturyn, but to protect the frontier beyond the Dnepr, thus using the Serbs as a buffer between Russia and Zaporozhian lands.

In October 1751, Khorvat brought the first party of settlers to

<sup>104</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9919, December 24, 1751; *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 403, 407; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, p. 713.

<sup>105</sup> Popov, *op. cit.*, p. 598; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 712.

<sup>106</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9919, December 24, 1751; Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.* . . , I, 21.

Kiev, which at that time was the gathering and distributing point for all foreign immigrants; it numbered only 208 people, including women and children. Khorvat proceeded to St. Petersburg, where he submitted a more detailed plan of colonization. This time, he proposed to settle sixteen thousand people instead of the original figure of three thousand, to be divided into four regiments, two Hussar and two Pandur infantry, each of four thousand people. In addition to the Serbs, Khorvat intended to recruit Macedonians, Moldavians and persons of other nationalities. He asked for various privileges, such as the right of free trade with Western Europe and Russia; pensions for widows; permission for Serbian officers to retain the ranks which they had held abroad; the payment of maintenance monies to all regiments, in full to the Hussars and up to two-thirds to the Pandurs; the right to use Russian subjects in building fortifications; a hereditary colonelcy of a Hussar regiment; and so forth.<sup>107</sup>

On December 24, 1751, a decree of the Empress, which enjoined the Senate and the Military College to look into the affair, set down the guiding precept of the official attitude towards Serbian settlements. The chief purpose of the colonization was, in the opinion of the government, "to make possible the peopling of the sparsely settled lands [which are] necessary for the defense of the frontiers." The decree accordingly recommended treating the Serbians with consideration, "so that those arriving might not be vexed and driven away, and might also be encouraged to come in greater numbers to settle within our boundaries."<sup>108</sup> Thus, in its endeavor to encourage foreigners to come to Russia, the Russian government not only ignored the interests of the local population, but sacrificed these interests to those of the newcomers.

<sup>107</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9919, December 24, 1751; No. 9924, January 11, 1752; *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 403, 405; "Ekstrakt o novoserbskom byvshem poselenii i o polkakh gusarskom i pandurskom, pod komandoyu Khorvata uchrezhdennykh" [Abstract Concerning the Former New Serbian Settlement and the Hussar and Pandur Regiments Established under the Command of Khorvat] *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov* [Collection of Military-Historical Materials], fasc. XVI, pp. 116-118.

<sup>108</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9919, December 24, 1751.

The proposals of Khorvat were examined by the Senate and the Military College at meetings on December 25 and 27, 1751. On December 29 a decree was issued incorporating most, though not all, of the points of Khorvat's proposal without change and outlining a broad program of organization for the foreign settlements.<sup>109</sup> All this was confirmed in the charter granted to Khorvat, dated January 11, 1752, and the territory allotted to the Serbs was for the first time called Nova Serbiya. The name gained official recognition, although the same charter stipulated that people of "Serbian" as well as those of "Macedonian, Bulgarian and Moldavian origin" and Orthodox faith were to be settled there. Khorvat was permitted to recruit four regiments, two Husar and two Pandur, each 4,000 men strong. He and his descendants were given the hereditary rank of colonel in one of the Husar regiments. Regimental officers were to have the same ranks as those held by their counterparts in the Russian army. All regiments were granted a liberal land allowance, for the exclusive use of foreign settlers. Upon entering service, all immigrants were to receive a year's pay; later on, officers were to receive their full pay, while rank-and-file soldiers were to receive quarter pay in time of peace and half pay in time of war. Widows and orphans were to retain the holdings of their husbands and fathers and receive their annual pay. For the protection of the settlers the St. Elizabeth (Sv. Yelizaveta) fortress was to be built, and a garrison of "territorial militia" stationed there. The settlers were permitted free trade with other countries, "Great" and "Little" Russia excepted. In order to speed the recruitment of troops, only those who would bring "a certain number of people" from abroad were to receive a commission. The charter also stated that no subject "should dare to oppose, vex, or wrong [the new settlers], but should favor them, as newcomers, and show them, on appropriate occasions, all possible assistance." Justice in Nova Serbiya was to be administered according to the military code.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>109</sup> PSZ, No. 9921, December 29, 1751; *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 402-418, 425.

<sup>110</sup> PSZ, No. 9924, January 11, 1752. In commemoration of the founding of Nova Serbiya, a medal was struck. It bore the inscription: "Nova Serbia Constituta MDCCLI. See, Skal'kovski, *Khronologi obozr.* . . . , I, 10.

The organization of Nova Serbiya was specified in even greater detail in the "Instruction to the Commander in Chief of Nova Serbiya," issued on February 3, 1752. In this document the area of Nova Serbiya as a whole, as well as that of lands granted to individual functionaries, was exactly defined; the sums destined for the maintenance of the regiments in times of peace and war were also specified. Thus, each Hussar regiment, with nominally 4,000 men, was allotted 35,148 rubles in peace time and 154,847 rubles, 85 kopecks in war time; each Pandur regiment, of the same nominal strength, was allotted 23,898 rubles, 66 kopecks in peace time and 114,142 rubles 90 kopecks in war time. Fifty thousand rubles were assigned for the organization of the settlements.<sup>111</sup>

The Serbs arrived in the area set aside for them, henceforth called Nova Serbiya, in 1752. From this date the history of the Serbian colonization begins.

It is difficult to estimate precisely the number of people brought by Khorvat. Exact statistics were not common in the eighteenth century; moreover, it was not to Khorvat's advantage to furnish precise figures. Only after ten years, towards the end of the existence of Nova Serbiya, did it become possible to ascertain the number of foreign settlers more or less precisely. This point will be returned to later. Here it can simply be stated that this colonization did not achieve its expected intensity, nor justify the hopes of the Russian government.

The exodus of such a considerable number of emigrants perturbed the Austrian government. Arrests began among the leaders of the colonization movement; their families were kept back or denied passports. Bestuzhev-Ryumin could only negotiate for an agreement on principle to the departure of those willing to emigrate to Russia. Even on this point he was not successful. A conflict between Russia and Austria over this matter led to the replacement of Bestuzhev-Ryumin by Count Keyserling (Keizerling), who continued the negotiations with more tact and modera-

<sup>111</sup> PSZ, No. 9935, February 3, 1752.

tion. He did not, however, achieve any substantial success, although the Serbian officers detained in Hungary were set free.<sup>112</sup>

Almost simultaneously with the establishment of foreign colonists in Nova Serbiya, i. e., on the right bank of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands," the colonization of the left bank of this area began. Soon after the visit of Khorvat, Bestuzhev-Ryumin was approached by two other colonels of the Serbian troops, Ivan Šević, and Rajko de Preradović, each of whom submitted a similar proposal for bringing a Serbian Hussar regiment to Russia. Bestuzhev-Ryumin directed them to Russia, and by 1752 Šević and Preradović were in Kiev, together with their families and recruits. From Kiev they proceeded alone to the Imperial Court, to solicit exemptions and privileges. At the Court they argued that they should not be put under Khorvat's command in Russia, because their rank in Austria had been higher than his, and neither wished to be subordinate to the other. Each one requested an independent position and separate territories for himself and his regiment.<sup>113</sup> The Senate found itself in a difficult position. First, it offered to settle them outside the Ukraine, in the Orenburg province; later, it proposed to establish them along the Ukrainian Line among the "territorial militia" regiments. Neither of these projects, however, was acceptable to the Serbs. Šević demanded for himself a part of Nova Serbiya, independent of Khorvat, while Preradović asked for a zone along the Dnepr River, running from the Orel River to Kins'ki Vody and Bakhmut, i. e., to the very heart of Zaporizhzhya.<sup>114</sup> Time passed, and the Serbian colonels continued to haggle with the Senate, demanding more favorable conditions, privileges equal to those granted to Khorvat, recognition of their merits, and so forth. At the same time they importuned those of power and influence at the Court

<sup>112</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 624-625, 627, 630, 733-734; N. Popov, ed., "Izvestiye. . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 83-90, 104, 122-64.

<sup>113</sup> Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 717-726; *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 679, 683-691, 703-707, 713, 727-730, 735-736; N. Popov, ed., "Izvestiye. . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 176-178; N. Popov, "Voyennye poseleniya. . .," *op. cit.*, p. 606; Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.* . . ., I, 24-25.

<sup>114</sup> PSZ, Nos. 10049, November 20, 1752; 101104, May 29, 1753; *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 679, 681-91, 726-27; IX, 14, 21-22, 44; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 724.

with their petitions, complaints, and mutual denunciations. These actions, so indicative of the colonels' true character, would have repelled anyone with a sense of propriety somewhat stricter than that of the magnates of the eighteenth century. Suffice it here to mention the following colorful episode: Colonel Šević borrowed from Ensign Vulich a portrait of Peter I given by the Tsar to Vulich's grandfather. He carried it to Bestuzhev-Ryumin and told the latter that it was the Tsar's personal gift to him, Šević, and demanded special attention.<sup>115</sup>

S. S. Pišćević, the author of valuable memoirs, has left a picturesque description of the incessant quarrels and the internal struggle between the leaders of the colonists.<sup>116</sup> No less interesting and instructive are Pišćević's own adventures. Although he never obtained a leading position in the regiments as a captain, he found his way to the Court, attended the Empress' receptions and the balls of the most prominent magnates, to which he had gained access by bribing their servants, and finally achieved success.<sup>117</sup>

While the colonels and generals were "cooling their heels" in the ante-rooms of St. Petersburg, the Serbians, whom they had left behind in Kiev, live in the burgesses' houses of Podil, where quarters had been assigned to them. The peaceful inhabitants were exasperated by the Serbians' boisterous ways, their fights, quarrels and limitless demands.<sup>118</sup>

<sup>115</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 28-29.

<sup>116</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye o pokhozhdanii...", *op. cit.*, p. 177. A. Pišćević writes that, under the influence of her entourage, Empress Elizabeth was afraid to settle all the Serbs at the same time; in reality the Serbian leaders had quarrelled among themselves and did not want to live together. A. Pishchevich, "Primechaniya na Novorossiiskii krai" [Notes on the New Russian Region], *Kiyevskaya starina*, VIII, 1884, 113.

<sup>117</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye o pokhozhdanii..." *op. cit.*, pp. 172-175, 204-14, 359-96. Pišćević's description of the tactics of "assault" on magnates is characteristic: "If you want to approach a high Lord quickly, then try to become acquainted with that servant who is closest to his master and have frequent conversations with him... I have not seen one who did not have such a servant with him... try to get acquainted with this servant." (Page 205, note.)

<sup>118</sup> "Serby v Kiyeve 1753-54" [Serbians in Kiev, 1753-54], *Kiyevskaya starina*, IX, 1885, 381-85.



The final decision on the settlement of the regiments of Šević and Preradović was taken by the Senate at its meeting of March 31, 1753. The problem was linked with the new plans for the protection of the Ukraine, i. e., the construction of a new Ukrainian Line and the establishment of the "territorial militia" regiments. The Senate meeting was attended by representatives of the Foreign Affairs and Military Colleges, Major General Glebov, Commander in Chief of Nova Serbiya, General Tolstoi, and Colonel Bibikov, who had just returned from the old Ukrainian Line, which he had inspected by order of the Senate. The new Line was to run from the mouth of the Samara River to Bakhmut, and the Senate decided to settle the Serbian regiments beyond Bakhmut.<sup>119</sup>

The demands of Šević and Preradović were considered excessive. They received the following reply to their petitions: "The lands requested by Šević have already been settled by Khorvat; as to Preradović's demand, it is impossible to grant such a vast area to him." The land between Bakhmut and the Luhan'ka (Lugan) was ample enough for the two colonels and their regiments; in the Senate's opinion, five thousand people could be settled there. If the colonels brought more colonists, they would be provided with as large an additional area as was necessary.<sup>120</sup> At its session of May 17, 1753, the Senate notified Šević and Preradović that they had been endowed with lands: "one of them [with lands] stretching from Bakhmut, and the other [with lands stretching] from the Luhan'." They would have to consult Colonel Bibikov in the matter of the division of this territory.<sup>121</sup> Thus, a Serbian colony was founded on the left bank of the Dnepr; to avoid confusion with Nova Serbiya, it was named Slavyanoserbiya.

In this manner foreign colonies were founded on both banks of the Dnepr between 1751 and 1753. They were situated in the area regarded by the Zaporozhians as their "Free Lands" and con-

<sup>119</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 690 and IX, 54-56, 78.

<sup>120</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10104, May 29, 1753.

<sup>121</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 78; Popov, ed., "Izvestiye o pokhozhdennykh..." *op. cit.*, p. 178.

firmed as such by the Russian government in Elizabeth's charter of December 15, 1744.<sup>122</sup> In granting this territory to the Serbs, the government stressed the fact that it was destined for colonization. Thus it ignored its own decisions, preceding the foundation of Nova Serbiya by only a few years, by which this area had been attached to the Myrhorod regiment. It also disregarded several decrees, issued at the same time, which opened the area to colonization to all comers. It has already been pointed out how rapidly farmsteads, settlements, and small towns had sprung up in this area. The Russian government was not only indifferent toward the population which had increased so much in such a short period of time, but it sacrificed the interests of these people to those of the newcomers. This time the government could not plead ignorance of the actual situation, an excuse which had often been valid in the course of the eighteenth century. Colonel de Bosquet, who had traveled through the area, was summoned to the Senate session of January 9, 1752. He submitted the map which he had drawn in 1745 and informed the Senate that the whole territory on which Nova Serbiya was to be founded had already been settled by 1745, and he added that to his knowledge "quite a number of new settlements had been founded since that date."<sup>123</sup> This testimony, however, was not taken into consideration.

#### IV. THE TERRITORY OF NOVA SERBIYA AND SLAVYANOSERBIYA

The boundaries of Nova Serbiya were fixed by the decree of December 29, 1751 in the following manner: "From the mouth of the Kaharlyk River in a direct line to the sources of the Tura, [then] to the mouth of the Kamyanka River, from there to the sources of the Berezivka, from there to the upper part of the Omel'nyk, then it follows this river down to its mouth, where

<sup>122</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki* . . . , pp. 1394-1398; P. Ivanov, "Materialy po istorii Zaporozh'ya XVIII st." [Material on the History of Zaporizhzhya in the XVIII century], *Zapiski odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*. XX, 1897, 68, 82-83.

<sup>123</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 425.

it joins the Dnepr; [the boundary runs] at a distance of 20 versts from the Polish frontier."<sup>124</sup> These boundaries were confirmed in the instructions given to General Glebov on February 3, 1752.<sup>125</sup> The territory thus defined was destined for the settlement of two regiments only, one Hussar and one Pandur; should some more "non-serving settlers" (*nesluzhashchiye*) come, the government promised to allot to them separate "appropriate places."<sup>126</sup> In the same year, Khorvat notified the Senate that quite a number of Orthodox "common people" (*prostonarodstva*) and twelve "of their leaders" intended to come to Nova Serbiya. He asked therefore that they be granted land. The Senate decreed to them the strip running along the Dnepr from Nova Serbiya to the Khortytsya island. There was no need to implement this decision, however, for neither the Orthodox "common people" nor "their leaders" ever appeared.

In the north and west, Nova Serbiya bordered upon Polish territories. In the south it touched the "Free Lands" of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, while the Dnepr separated it from the Russian Empire, or to be more precise, from the area of the Myrhorod regiment. This last border was the shortest, while the frontier with Poland was the longest. Constituting a narrow belt, which cut deeply between the Polish and the Zaporozhian possessions, Nova Serbiya was but loosely attached to Russia, both territorially and administratively. The route used for most communications with Kiev, upon which Nova Serbiya was dependent administratively, passed through Polish territory. Thus in 1753, when Nova Serbiya's commander in chief, Major General I. F. Glebov, was about to go from Kiev to Nova Serbiya, he requested, through the chief commander of Kiev, permission from the Polish government to pass through its domains.<sup>127</sup>

<sup>124</sup> PSZ, No. 9921, December 29, 1751. A. Shmidt considered that the Vys' was called the Tura River, *Materialy dlya statishcheskago opisaniya Rossiiskoi imperii, Khersonskaya guberniya*, I, 29. However this is incorrect; it was the Hruz'ka River which was known as the Tura (*Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 64).

<sup>125</sup> PSZ, No. 9935, February 3, 1752; No. 9967, March 23, 1752.

<sup>126</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 476.

<sup>127</sup> KTsaDA, *Fond kiyevskoi gubernskoi kantselyarii*, No. 3772 (old listing).

The Polish boundaries continued to be rather indefinite, a circumstance which led to frequent misunderstandings between the representatives of Nova Serbiya and the Polish government. The answer of the commander in chief of Nova Serbiya, Glebov, to a Polish *starosta* (district administrator, pl. *starostowie*), Byszewski, in 1755, is typical in this respect. Byszewski complained against Khorvat, who, he said, was seizing Polish territory for Nova Serbiya settlements and placing "mounds" (which served as frontier markers) on his own authority. "The Nova Serbiya settlements," Glebov wrote, "are founded on territories indisputably Russian. Before the colonization of Nova Serbiya took place, these territories of Her Imperial Majesty were inhabited by her Little Russian subjects. . . ; as for the contention that the aforementioned Major General [i. e., Khorvat] appropria- tions Polish territory for Nova Serbiya, the reports received by Your Honor are incorrect."<sup>128</sup> In his turn, Khorvat complained against the unlawful seizure of a zone of land whose occupation by the Poles was anterior to the establishment of Nova Serbiya.<sup>129</sup>

It is worth mentioning that in this frontier zone the authorities of Nova Serbiya had to deal chiefly with the owners of neighboring large estates, like the Princes Lyubomirski, the Counts Branicki and Potocki, and others, and with their intendants. Both the Poles and the Nova Serbiya people kept a close watch on one another to prevent the building of fortifications near the frontier. Thus, the construction of a Polish stronghold on the Southern Bug near Targowica prompted a protest by Khorvat. He complained to the Senate about the local authorities, especially Murav'yov, the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress, who, in Khorvat's absence, had not manifested due vigilance and had failed to prevent the construction of the fort. The Senate explained that the law had not been infringed upon in this case, but granted that it would have been better not to allow the building of a Polish fortress at such close proximity to the fron-

<sup>128</sup> Zbirka dokumentiv N. D. Polons'koi-Vasylenko [Collection of Documents of N. DD. Polons'ka-Vasylenko], I, 33.

<sup>129</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XI, 476.

tier.<sup>130</sup> Khorvat also protested against the erection of a fortress in Uman' by Potocki and the building of another opposite Ternivka.<sup>131</sup>

On the other hand, in order not to provoke either the Poles or the Turks, the Senate decreed that such fortified entrenchments as the St. Vladimir (Volodymyr) fortress, formerly Petrostriv, or the St. Nicholas (Mykola) fortress, situated between Hard and Novo-Myrhorod (Novo-Mirgorod) must not be called "fortresses." Thus in 1752 the Senate warned that "this settlement should not be called a fortress, either in correspondence or within the command, and all designations save that of 'settlement' must be forbidden."<sup>132</sup> The people, however, did not heed these regulations. All Serbian settlements were called "retrenchments" in the popular idiom, although only a few of them were fortified. Pišćević wrote that Hlyns'k, Kryliv and Kryukiv were the only fortified places in the Pandur regiment area.<sup>133</sup> Another reflection of the military character of these settlements was the use of "Hussar" for "Serb" in popular language, a usage which lasted for a long time.<sup>134</sup>

The chief cause of conflicts between the administration of Nova Serbiya and its Polish neighbors lay not so much in territorial disputes as in competition for manpower. Both in Nova Serbiya and on the Polish side, the authorities tried to colonize their lands as densely and as rapidly as possible. No means were despised, provided they helped achieve this goal: people were enticed from one side to another, and sometimes even kidnapped. During Nova Serbiya's existence, there were mutual accusations between the Poles and Khorvat, of raids, kidnappings, and so forth. Khorvat did not hesitate to advise the recruiting agents to raid Polish villages; it seems superfluous to add that these agents

<sup>130</sup> Dnipropetrovskyi istorichnyi arkhiv, *Fond Novoserbs'koho korpusa* [Deposits of the Novoserbiya Army Corps], file 22, No. 405, sheets 44-45, 373-75.

<sup>131</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 72-76, 87.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, XV, 674; IX, 38.

<sup>133</sup> A. Pishchevich, "Primechaniya na Novorossiiskii krai," *op. cit.*, p. 114.

<sup>134</sup> Preosv. Gavriil, *Otryvok povestvovaniya o Novorossiiskom kraye*, [Excerpts from an Account of the New Russia Region], Part II, Sec. 1, pp. 111-112.

were in no need of advice on this subject.<sup>135</sup> The voivode of the Kiev province, Count Potocki, the Crown Steward, Prince Lyubomirski, and the Crown Hetman, Count Branicki, complained to the Russian College of Foreign Affairs of a series of raids on Polish villages, perpetrated by Khorvat and his subordinates, in which people, cattle, and property were seized.

In 1760, the College of Foreign Affairs asked the Senate to advise Khorvat to be more considerate toward his neighbors, since his actions violated the stipulations of the "Eternal Peace." The Senate enjoined Khorvat to maintain "friendly and neighborly relations" with the Poles, since it "would be very difficult and expensive to repair" the damages he was inflicting upon them.<sup>136</sup> These admonitions were without effect, for in the same year the College passed on to the Senate new complaints by Potocki against Khorvat.<sup>137</sup> At the same time, Khorvat complained against the Poles in general for abducting colonists and settling them on their lands, and against the *starostowie* of the Polish magnates for provoking frontier incidents.<sup>138</sup> In most cases, however, Khorvat did not turn for help to the Senate, but settled the differences with his neighbors by his own means, as if he were an independent seigneur.<sup>139</sup> Sometimes his actions recall the deeds of medieval robber barons. On one occasion, he learned that a Polish detachment was approaching the confines of Nova Serbiya. While Khorvat invited its officers to dinner, his subordinates attacked the detachment on his orders and killed fifty people. Khorvat reported to the Senate that the Poles had invaded Nova Serbiya and that his Hussars had acted only in self-defense.<sup>140</sup> When an investigation was begun after Khorvat's

<sup>135</sup> V. Yastrebov, "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yelisavety," [Archives of the St. Elizabeth Fortress], *Zapiski Odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnosti*, XV, 1889, 556; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 1028.

<sup>136</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 560; XI, 358-359.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 413-414.

<sup>138</sup> Dnipropetrovskiy istor. arkhiv, *Fond Novoserbs'koho korpusa*, file 22, No. 403.

<sup>139</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 87-88.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 72-73; Popov, ed., "Izvestiye . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 426.

downfall, the Poles presented the investigating commission with complaints against "offenses caused them by Nova Serbiya."<sup>141</sup>

It must be said, however, that the relations of Khorvat and his subordinates with their Polish neighbors were not always bad. An interesting dossier of his correspondence—and that of other Serbian commanders—with Dobryanski, the Governor of Smila, had been preserved, from which one learns of everyday contacts and the exchange of wares and neighborly services, such as Khorvat's sending a physician and drugs to the governor's sick wife.<sup>142</sup>

Frontier relations with the Zaporozhians were of short duration. Two years after the creation of Nova Serbiya a zone between the latter and Zaporizhzhya was allotted to the Slobids'kyi regiment and referred to as "beyond the boundary of Nova Serbiya." This regiment, then, became the immediate neighbor of the Zaporozhians.

Of the two regiments settled on the territory of Nova Serbiya, one was the Hussar regiment of Khorvat, and the other a Pandur infantry regiment. The land was to be allotted to these regiments on the basis of the map drawn by de Bosquet. The Senate ordered two copies of this map to be made, one to remain in its possession, the other to be forwarded to Glebov. This order was not carried out, however, and the land was allotted "approximately." In 1752, when the Senate asked Glebov a series of questions (the allotment of lands to new settlers, the locations where fortresses were to be erected, the frontier with Poland and such matters), the latter answered that up to that time "there had been no need for a general map and, therefore, he did not possess one," but instead was using a local map of the region between Novoarkhangel's'k and the Dnepr. In response to a Senate request, Glebov had a map of the frontier with Poland drawn "confidentially." It was forwarded to the Senate towards the end of 1752.

<sup>141</sup> KTsADA, No. 3719 (old listing).

<sup>142</sup> Zbirka dokumentiv N. D. Polons'koi-Vasylenko.

After that date there are scattered indications of maps, local and general, being drawn.<sup>143</sup>

Khorvat's Hussar and Pandur regiments were allotted the western and eastern parts of Nova Serbiya respectively. Upon their arrival in Nova Serbiya, the first settlers received "resident quarters," i. e., they were quartered in the houses of the local population or had mud huts built for them. Khorvat insisted that special settlements "with fortifications" providing shelter from attack be built for the Serbians in Arkhangel's'k, Petroostriv, Novomyrhorod and Tsybuliv.<sup>144</sup> It was difficult to distribute the settlers in the "resident quarters," he wrote to the Senate, since "in Arkhangel's'k and in the settlements of Petroostriv almost all the houses are occupied. The housing situation in the St. Nicholas entrenchment is so desperate that there are no quarters for the Russians of various ranks who are to be attached to the regular regiment for the winter, especially the pharmacy and the chancery with their staffs."<sup>145</sup> Thus the first Serbian colonists were distributed in previously settled communities, such as Arkhangel's'k, Novomyrhorod, Tsybuliv, and Davydivka (Petroostriv). Many other settlements, already long inhabited, were occupied by Serbs and their names were changed.<sup>146</sup> Thus Ol'khovatka came to be called Panchov; Stetsivka, Shalmosh; Nesterivka, Bershats; Andrusivka, Chonhrad; Plankhtiivka, Zimun'; Try Bayraky, Kanizh; and so forth. Many of these names, artificially transplanted and alien to the local population, disappeared with Nova Serbiya, but some of them remained up to

<sup>143</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 425; IX, 5, 160; *Fond Novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 13, No. 152. It should be remembered that in those times the use of maps was not general. When Catherine II, during one of her first visits to the Senate, demanded to see a map of the Russian Empire, none could be found.

<sup>144</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 625, 707.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 707.

<sup>146</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 224; Kir'yakov, *Istoriko-statisticheskoye obozreniye Khezhsonskoi gubernii* [Historical and Statistical Survey of the Kherson Province], p. 171. For example, Ol'khovatka became Panchov; Stetsivka, Shalmosh; Nesterivka, Bershats; Andrusivka, Chonhrad; Plakhtiivka, Zymun'; Try Bayraky, Kanizh; etc.



recent times.<sup>147</sup> Simultaneously, with the occupation by the Serbs of existing villages, new ones were erected for them along the Vys' and Southern Bug rivers.<sup>148</sup>

There were twenty companies (*roty*) in each regiment. In the center of each company area was an entrenchment, sometimes fortified, also called *rota*. As has been pointed out above, the Senate had forbidden that these entrenchments be referred to as "fortresses," enjoining that they be called "settlements."<sup>149</sup>

At the outset nothing had been decided on the physical character of the settlements, a situation which led to sharp differences between Khorvat and the commander in chief, Glebov. The former insisted that relatively small "closed fortifications" with barracks be built. The latter, on the contrary, was for establishing the Serbs in large groups of a hundred houses or more, "for protection from evil-doers." The Senate sided with Glebov.<sup>150</sup> All the necessary building materials were provided by the government; the construction itself, of both living quarters and fortifications, was done by one thousand "Little Russian Cossacks," who were sent from their regiments. Khorvat sought to have another thousand sent, but both the Hetman and Glebov objected.<sup>151</sup>

<sup>147</sup> A. Pishchevich, "Primechaniya . . .," *op. cit.*, p. 118.

<sup>148</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 595, 672.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 674.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 706-708.

<sup>151</sup> PSZ. No. 9935, February 3, 1752. There were the following company settlements in Khorvat's Hussar regiment: 1. Novomyrhorod (formerly Trysyahy), Khorvat's residence and regimental headquarters; 2. Pichka (Korobchyno); 3. Petroostriv; 4. Nadlatsk; 5. Kalnybolot; 6. Semlek (Skeleva); 7. Novoarkhangel's'ke; 8. Martonosh (Yermina Balka); 9. Panchov (Ol'khovatka); 10. Kanyzh (Try Bayraky); 11. Sentiv (Mohyliv); 12. Vukovar; 13. Fedvar (Lyanyts'ka); 14. Subotish; 15. Tsybuliv; 16. Mashoryn (Ivankivtsi); 17. Dmytrivka; 18. Sambir (Tsykivka); 19. Hlyns'k; and 20. Bershats (Nesterivka). The Pandur regiment had the following company settlements: 1. Kryliv, the regiment's headquarters; 2. Taburyshche; 3. Kryukiv; 4. Kamyanka; 5. Zymun' (Plakhtiiivka); 6. Chanad; 7. Pilazhnitsa; 8. Kovyn; 9. Blahovat; 10. Slankamin'; 11. Becha (later—Oleksandriya); 12. Varazhdan; 13. Hlohovats; 14. Yaniv; 15. Shalmosh (Stetsivka); 16. Chonhrad (Andrusivka); 17. Pavlysh; 18. Mandorlak; 19. Santomash; and 20. Vinhosh. See, Skal'kovskii, *Khronologi. obozr.* . . . , I, 41-43.

Later the garrison of Novomyrhorod was added to those two regiments. It consisted of three Hussar and two Pandur companies. The lands for the garrison were allotted in 1759 after a protracted official correspondence. They were taken away from the Slobids'kyi regiment stationed "beyond the frontier of Nova Serbiya," and comprised the settlements of Tyshkivka, Krasna, Tashlyk, and Vys'. This meant a further increase of the area of Nova Serbiya.<sup>152</sup>

Although no contemporary descriptions of the Nova Serbiya settlements have come down to us, it is possible to form an idea of them from short descriptions written in 1775 by the Academician Gldenstdt (Gyul'denshtedt), who had traveled through the region. In his description of the Yelizavetgrad province (the former Nova Serbiya), he noted the existence of ancient fortifications. Thus in Taboryshche he saw "a fortified place, enclosed by a small embankment and a palisade"; in Hlyns'k, "an old fortification, with a palisade and a dike, . . . with no buildings inside, except a church, a guardhouse, a supply house, and a chancery. This fortification was used as a refuge in times of danger. The huts of the inhabitants stand, as in other companies, in rows forming regular streets." Not far from Arkhangel's'k, there was "a small redoubt, fenced in by a palisade."<sup>153</sup> It appears from these descriptions that most of the strongholds were small, consisting of a rampart with a palisade and a trench. It has already been pointed out that Arkhangel's'k lay on the trade route connecting the Sich and the Crimea with Poland. At the time of the creation of Nova Serbiya, it had already become an important trading post. Before the construction of the St. Elizabeth fortress, the commander, A. Glebov, had had his headquarters there.<sup>154</sup>

By chance we possess a description of one of Arkhangel's'k's residences belonging to Second Major Serezlyi. The building

<sup>152</sup> *Fond' novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 12, No. 151, (St. Elizabeth fortress No. 33).

<sup>153</sup> Gldenstdt, *Reisen durch Russland und im Caucasischen Gebirge*, St. Petersburg, 1791, II, 127, 146, 160-161.

<sup>154</sup> KTsADA, No. 1887; Biblioteka Akademii Nauk Rukopisny Viddil, *Arkhiv kriposti sv. Yelisavety*, [Archives of the St. Elizabeth Fortress], No. 3.

was purchased by the government in 1752 to provide headquarters for the surveying commissions marking off the frontiers with the Bratslav voivodeship. The manor was situated inside a fortification with an oaken stockade around it. It consisted of a five-room owner's house, two huts for the servants, two cellars—a "warm" one and an ice-house—a stable for twenty-four horses, and a large store-house. All the buildings were shingled. The residence was valued at 365 rubles.<sup>155</sup>

The principal administrative center of Nova Serbiya was in Novomyrhorod on the bank of the Synyukha River; both Khorvat's residence and the headquarters of his Hussar regiment were there. At an earlier date this settlement had been called Trysyahy. Later, Colonel Kapnist changed its name to Novomyrhorod (also often called Myrhorod for short). In 1752 Khorvat found about twenty houses there. He had an entrenchment built with five bastions "and fortifications, erected according to the requirements of the local situation and of the immediate and future dangers."<sup>156</sup> These fortifications, about two hundred meters in diameter, were girded by earthen ramparts and a trench. Access to them was provided by two gates. Khorvat's residence was within this stronghold. A walk bordered by linden trees ran around the wooden house with wings, stables for fifty horses and a beautiful orchard.<sup>157</sup> Houses of the more prominent people were there also, for example, the house of the archimandrite, Sophronius Dobrashevich. He had bought a house for 120 rubles and had it transported onto his land, a curious detail, which throws some light both on prices of buildings and on the manner in which they were erected in Nova Serbiya.<sup>158</sup>

<sup>155</sup> Biblioteka Akademii Nauk USSR, *Spravy kriposti sv. Yelysavety* [Documents of the St. Elizabeth Fortress], No. 74. The evaluation of the estate was made by a commission composed of the lieutenant of the Corps of Engineers, Khatyantsev, and two local merchants.

<sup>156</sup> A. Shmidt, *Materialy...*, I, 31.

<sup>157</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, pp. 401, 411.

<sup>158</sup> Arkhimandrit Arsenii, "Sofronii Dobrashevich, arkhimandrit Novoi Serbii" [Sophronius Dobrashevich, Archimandrite of Nova Serbiya], *Kiyevskaya starina* X, 1884, 291.

It is possible to trace the subsequent fate of these two buildings. After Khorvat's downfall, his residence was left unfinished, including the new house built "according to the Prussian fashion." This and Dobrashevich's home became state property and began to decay slowly. In 1767 an attempt was made to utilize the orchards and the buildings, but no bidder for the lease of the orchards were found. All the government obtained was a volunteer to buy a year's crop "on the trees" for three rubles. At the same time contractors were sought to undertake the restoration of the buildings and announcements to this effect were made at the market place on market days. A detailed investigation showed that the buildings were completely uninhabitable. The archimandrite's house was made of green lumber and "had rotted completely from standing for a long time without a roof." Another building, the so-called "engineer's house," was made of stakes and also collapsed. Stables and storehouses were rotted and no building materials could be salvaged from them. Therefore the investigating commission decided to sell all the buildings and use the proceeds for the restoration of Khorvat's house.<sup>159</sup>

These details give an idea of the exterior appearance of Novo-Myrhorod. If the better houses were in such a state, it is easy to imagine the conditions of the quarters of the humbler inhabitants. It appears from other documents that most of the houses were covered with shingle, bought in nearby Smila province.<sup>160</sup> Building materials, such as boards, dry wood and stakes for the palisades, also came from that source, mainly from the Nerubay forest. The scarcity of craftsmen in the region may be inferred from the long polemics between Khorvat and the Governor of Smila, Dobryanski, concerning a mason from Kiev, Horbatyi by name. He was to build ovens in Khorvat's house, but went to Smila instead. Khorvat maintained that a messenger of Dobryanski had enticed him to go. The Governor denied hav-

<sup>159</sup> *Arkhiv kriptosti Sv. Yelysavety*, No. 174.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 143.

ing had any part in that affair but did not deny that Horbatyi actually had moved to Smila.<sup>161</sup>

Other official agencies stationed in Novomyrhorod were the regimental chancery, and, later, the "Main Chancery of the Nova Serbiya Corps" or the "Main Nova Serbiya Chancery." Soldiers' barracks and officers' quarters were there also.<sup>162</sup>

This is how Khorvat himself described Novomyrhorod: "Inside the fortifications under the same roof, there were a coffee-house with a billiard room, four other rooms, a kitchen, and six shops in which the merchants lived. Each of these merchants paid a lease of a hundred rubles annually. On the outskirts (*na forshadtate*) there was a market place with fourteen shops, all under one roof. The yearly lease for them ran from six to twelve rubles. Goods were sold there, even including grizet-cloth ['grisaille']. Generally speaking, the shops in Myrhorod are better than those on the outskirts of the St. Elizabeth fortress." Pišćević explained that most of the vendors in the Myrhorod shops were Khorvat's own servants.<sup>163</sup> There was also a school in Novomyrhorod, run by a regular priest (*iyeromonakh*), assisted by the deacon, Paul; Khorvat's sons studied there.<sup>164</sup> In 1752, Khorvat built the small wooden Church of the Virgin's Nativity in the town and it remained there until 1825.<sup>165</sup> Also in 1752, Khorvat began the construction of the large St. Nicholas Cathedral. He invited the architect Stephen Stabyns'kyi to supervise the work, but Stabyns'kyi died before its completion.<sup>166</sup> The cathedral was built partly of brick; its upper part was of wood. It

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>162</sup> *Fond novoserb. korpusa*, file 45, No. 926.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>164</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, p. 403.

<sup>165</sup> Arkhim. Arsenii, *op. cit.*, p. 282; Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, p. 405.

<sup>166</sup> Arkhim. Arsenii, *op. cit.*, pp. 277, 281, 287; *Fond novoserb. korpusa*, file 59, No. 1419, which also contains the complaint of Stabyns'kyi's widow against Khorvat to the effect that the latter had seized her estate in Novo-Myrhorod and ruined her.

had a nave-like shape with low vaults.<sup>167</sup> In 1753 Khorvat wanted to build a monastery in the town, at his own expense, but was unable to secure permission from the Synod. It was not until 1757 that the construction of the monastery was started on the bank of the Vys' River, three kilometers from the town.<sup>168</sup>

The center of the Pandur infantry regiment was in the small, old town of Kryliv (later Novo-Georgievs'k). By 1745 it had a relatively large number of inhabitants and two churches. In 1775, according to the account of Gldenstdt, it had one thousand inhabitants, while only six hundred people lived in Novomyrhorod at that time.<sup>169</sup>

Lands for the companies were allotted very liberally, since the Hussars had horses to graze and feed. Thus in the Hussar regiment every company received an area of 8.5 by 31.6 kilometers, amounting to 367.6 square kilometers in all. Infantry companies were less richly endowed; each infantry company was allotted an arch of 6.36 by 27.56 kilometers, equalling only 175.28 square kilometers. The land was allotted not according to the numerical strength of the regiment, but according to the number of companies in each regiment.<sup>170</sup>

Part of these lands went to officers and clergy. In apportioning the officers' lands, the practice adopted in the "territorial militia" regiments was followed.<sup>171</sup> However, in the "Instruction" to Khorvat, he was allowed to adopt a different system, if necessary.<sup>172</sup> Theoretically, a surveyor was to allot the plots and keep a record of them; in practice, however, this was inconvenient and the lands were distributed among the companies.<sup>173</sup> In both regiments, more liberal land endowments were made for com-

167 S. Patenko, "Gorod Novomirhorod, yevo khramy i dukhovnoye upravleniye" [The Town of Novomirhorod, its Churches and Ecclesiastic Administration], *Pribavleniia k Khersonskim yeparkhial'nym vedomostyam* [Supplements to the Kherson Diocesan News], 1880, No. 13, pp. 387-393.

168 *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 25-27, 73; Arkhim. Arseni, *op. cit.*, p. 284.

169 Gldenstdt, *op. cit.*, II, 128, 154.

170 *PSZ*, No. 9966, March 23, 1752.

171 *Ibid.*, No. 9935, February 3, 1752.

172 A. Klauss, *Nashi kolonii* [Our Colonies], Issue 1, St. Petersburg, 1860, p. 67.

173 *PSZ*, No. 9935, February 3, 1752.

panies on whose territories regimental headquarters were to be established, in order to provide for the needs of the colonel, his adjutant, the regimental quartermaster, drummers and trumpeters. In the Hussar regiment, an extra grant of land was made to the Novomyrhorod company for Khorvat's manor.<sup>174</sup> In addition, a certain area, intended for widows and orphans of functionaries, was kept as reserve by each regiment.<sup>175</sup> At Khorvat's request, the Senate authorized allotments of land in Nova Serbiya to foreigners, veterans of other regiments who had been discharged by reason of age or disability.<sup>176</sup> In 1752 this authorization was extended to the old and disabled and to minors of foreign origin, coming from abroad. All such persons were to receive, in addition to grants of land, a subsidy of ten rubles per head and some seed. After their coming of age, minors were promised enrollment in the regiments.<sup>177</sup>

At the same time, it was forbidden to allot lands to the original Russians serving in the regiments. Those officials who held the positions of quartermaster, regimental clerk (*pysar*), auditor, or commissioner, were authorized to receive temporary grants of land. The reason given for this restriction was that, once the foreigners "had adjusted," they "undoubtedly would be able" to fulfill those function as well.<sup>178</sup>

It has been already pointed out that with the creation of Nova Serbiya the local population was forced to leave the territories granted to the foreigners and return to their "previous homes." This order concerned not only Cossacks and peasants but also

<sup>174</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10029, September 21, 1752.

<sup>175</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10006 July 2, 1752.

<sup>176</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9993, May 29, 1752; No. 10037, October 19, 1752.

<sup>177</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10272, August 9, 1754.

<sup>178</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10006, July 2, 1752. Conditions of their service were very hard.

Khorvat and the Commander in Chief, Glebov, informed the Senate that devoting their entire day to the service "they cannot take care of their household and have no time for it either; and it is impossible to repair the regulation uniform and to provide for all other subsistence from the regular salary." The Senate ordered that these officials be given "rations" from the supplies of Nova Serbiya. *PSZ*, No. 10492, December 21, 1755.

landlords. Colonel Kapnist, to give an example, was deprived of his domains.<sup>179</sup> A considerable part of this "population not covered by decree" (*bezukaznoye naseleniye*) did not want to return to regions where serfdom awaited it. Instead, it moved further south, beyond the boundaries of Nova Serbiya.

In 1753, to keep the population from moving to Zaporizhzhya or Poland, the government created a Cossack Slobids'kyi regiment on the pattern of the other Slobids'ki regiments. A belt twenty versts wide and running between Nova Serbiya and Zaporizhzhya, was apportioned to this regiment.<sup>180</sup> The colonization of this region proceeded so rapidly that people began to found settlements outside the belt, without waiting for official decrees. Thus in 1754 the officers of the regiment seized the area along the Samotkan' and Domotkan' rivers, where the Zaporozhians had their winter quarters.<sup>181</sup> The pressure against these winter quarters was exerted again in the same year, with the result that they began to pass into the officers' hands. The decree of 1756, issued to the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress, allotted lands situated along the Samotkan', Beshka, and Verblyuzhka rivers to the Slobids'kyi regiment.<sup>182</sup> In 1757 the recruiting agent Hrydyn settled some Old Believers in a spot called Lysa Hora on the Chortomlyk River, fifty versts beyond the border. By orders of Colonel Derkach, this settlement, as well as that of Pischanyi Brid, was destroyed by the Zaporozhians in 1763.<sup>183</sup> Thus the Slobids'kyi regiment, the most advanced outpost in the direction of Zaporizhzhya, was in constant struggle with the Cossacks and gradually penetrated into their domains.

In its organization, the Cossack Slobids'kyi regiment followed its prototypes. It was divided into *sotni*, with small towns as their administrative centers (*sotenni mistechka*), and settlements. However, the influence of Nova Serbiya was felt; in 1754 the Senate ordered the construction of "small entrenchments" along

<sup>179</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 510-511.

<sup>180</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 134; *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 125-26.

<sup>181</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 171-72.

<sup>182</sup> Evarnitski, *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kozakov*, I, 36-37.

<sup>183</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 171, 257-58.



the Ternivka and Vys' rivers, which were modeled on those built in Nova Serbiya.<sup>184</sup>

Thus the regimental area consisted of some old and well populated towns, such as Borodaïvka or Domotkan', which were known before the creation of Nova Serbiya, and some newly-founded communities, such as Pletenyi Tashlyk, Vys', and Zelena. They were inhabited either by Cossacks, most of whom were Ukrainian, or by Russian Old Believers (Zlynka, Klyntsi, and others).<sup>185</sup>

The main economic and administrative center of the Slobids'kyi regiment was in the St. Elizabeth fortress, which later became the town of Yelizavetgrad (today, Kirovograd). The fortress was founded in 1754. As indicated above, in its first charters which outlined the conditions of Khorvat's colonization of Nova Serbiya, the Russian government promised to have an "earthen stronghold" built by Russian subjects.<sup>186</sup> In fact, however, as late as 1754 no work on the stronghold had been undertaken. It took a long time to find a convenient place on which to build the fortress and it was only at its meetings of March 21 and April 1, 1753 that the Senate confirmed the choice of a site for the construction.<sup>187</sup> The fortress was to be erected on the Inhul River, between the mouths of the Hruz'ka (i. e., the Tura) and Kamyanysta Suhakleya rivers at a distance of four kilometers from the frontier of Nova Serbiya.<sup>188</sup> According to the plan, the fortress was to be a link in a chain of strongholds, extending from Myshuryñ Rih on the Dnepr to Arkhangel's'k on the Vys' River

184 *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 150. In 1761 the *Slobidskyi* regiment had the following administrative centers (sotni): 1. Pushkarivka, 2. Domotkan', 3. Borodaïvka, 4. Myshuryñ Rih, 5. Kam'yanka, 6. Kaluzhyne, 7. Boyans'ka, 8. Omel'nyk, 9. Troynyts'ka, 10. Zelena, 11. Verblyuzhka, 12. Rivnyanka, 13. Beshka, 14. Murzynka, 15. Adzhamka, 16. Kalynivka, 17. Inhul's'ka, 18. Hruz'ka, 19. Vysz', 20. Pletenyi Tashlyk, 21. Krasna. 22. Tyshkivka (Ol'shanka), 23. Ternivka, 24. Dobryanka, 25. Orel. See, Bibl. akad. nauk., *Arkhiv kriptosti sv. Yelisavety*, No. 89; Skal'kovski, *Khronologi. obozr....*, I 42-43.

185 Skal'kovski, *Khronologi. obozr....*, I, 42.

186 *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 411, 416.

187 *Ibid.* pp. 652-53, 673, 691, 730, 740.

188 *Ibid.*, IX, 64.

and protecting Nova Serbiya from the south.<sup>189</sup> Although those most interested in the construction of the fortress were the settlers of Nova Serbiya, it was to be built by Russian subjects. The Senate ordered the despatching of two thousand Cossacks from the Left-Bank Ukraine.<sup>190</sup> Hetman Rozumov'skyi was hostile towards this demand and sent only five hundred people. The number was later raised to one thousand, including Cossacks, their tenants (*pidsusidky*), and *pospolyty*.<sup>191</sup> They felled trees in Chornyi Lis, transported the lumber, did the building and worked on the earthworks.<sup>192</sup> In addition to the Cossacks, soldiers of the regular regiments, as well as convicts (*kolodnyky*, the term current at that time) were used.<sup>193</sup>

The work was supervised by Major (later Lieutenant Colonel) Ludwig Johann Menzelius (Mentselius) of the Corps of Engineers, and the plans for the fortress were subject to confirmation by the Senate.<sup>194</sup> At first, the construction proceeded at a rapid rate, and this very rapidity alarmed the Turkish government. Obreskov, the Russian minister resident in Constantinople, was handed an official query as to the purpose of the fortress. In vain did he try to calm the suspicions of the Porte, pointing out that the fortress under construction was further away from the Turkish frontier than was Arkhangel's'k, which had not disturbed anyone and adding that the sole purpose of the stronghold would be to ward off the incursions of the *haydamaky*. The Porte was not satisfied. It requested the mediation of European powers and approached the English and Austrian ambassadors. They advised Obreskov not to provoke the Porte and to discontinue the construction of the fortress.<sup>195</sup> The Russian government asked the Porte through Obreskov to send a "reliable person" to investigate the matter on the spot. It also provided the Porte with correct

189 *Ibid.*, p. 156-57; A. Shmidt, *Materialy...*, I, 32.

190 Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 714.

191 Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr...*, I, 23, 53 (Note 10).

192 *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysavety*, No. 3.

193 *Ibid.*, Nos. 82, 91; Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr...*, I, p. 53 (note 10).

194 *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelisavety*, No. 36.

195 Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 817-18, 841-42.

data on the fortress.<sup>196</sup> Simultaneously, the Russian government promised the Porte not to continue the construction, but to leave the fortress at the stage reached by that time.<sup>197</sup> This promise was not kept, however, and the construction continued in strict secrecy. Of course, this secret was not kept for long.<sup>198</sup> In 1754 the Porte sent two envoys, Devlet-Ali-Oglu from Constantinople and Bulat-Agu from Ochakiv, to visit the fortress. Obreskov, notifying General Glebov of the impending visit, advised him to arrange matters so as to create the impression that the fortress was not to be completed.<sup>199</sup> All went well and the envoys returned fully satisfied. Having received Glebov's report on this visit, the Senate issued a decree ordering the completion of the fortress.<sup>200</sup>

In 1755, however, the Russian government had to stop work on the fortress. Since Obreskov was unsuccessful in convincing the Porte that it should renounce its most recent demand for a halt in construction, the Senate ordered the commander in chief to stop the works temporarily. A supplementary order of the Senate permitted the completion of unfinished buildings, but forbade the construction of new ones.<sup>201</sup> Thus the assertion of A. Shmidt that the fortress was built in two years must be considered erroneous.<sup>202</sup> It was under construction for two years, but it was not completed.

The Senate was periodically faced with the question of continuing the construction of the fortress. Its commander, Major General Yust, reported to the Senate in 1758 that in its existing state the fortress could not provide protection from an enemy attack. "As yet there are no gates, nor has the ditch been dug

196 *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 263-64, 276-78; KTsADA, *Fond kiyevskoi gubernskoi kantselyarii*, No. 10443 (old listing).

197 *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 276-77.

198 *Ibid.*, p. 450.

199 Odesskyi istorychnyi muzey, *Rukopysna Zbirka Odes'koho "Obshchestva istorii i drevnostei"*; Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 151-52.

200 *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 450-51.

201 *Ibid.*, pp. 531, 585-89.

202 A. Shmidt, *Materialy...*, I, 32.

deeply enough; the only thing is the stockade surrounding the fortress; there is no regular covered way or glacis, the building of which around a fortress is commonly held to be necessary; the main rampart is in bad shape, since it has not been raised high enough."<sup>203</sup> The builder of the fortress, Engineer Menzelius, wrote a year later that "it consists only of a wall."<sup>204</sup> A few years later in 1762, Menzelius again reported on the condition of the fortress to the Senate. It did not even deserve the name of a fortress, he said. By way of fortifications, there was nothing except a ditch and an earthen rampart, dug out in the process of making the ditch; no parapets, no bridges, no stockade, since the one built in 1756 had rotted away and collapsed. In 1762, in connection with rumors of an impending attack by the Crimean Tatars, a commission consisting of Governor General Glebov, Lieutenant General Mel'gunov, Major General Brink and Brigadier Murav'yov, commander of the fortress, decided that it was imperative to complete the fortress and submitted a report to this effect to the Senate. The Senate, however, found that it was not advisable to complete the construction, "for the sake of neighborly friendship and peace." It authorized only the improvement of the condition of the stockade.<sup>205</sup>

The unfinished fortress was also rather inadequately provided with weapons. It possessed 120 cannons, 12 mortars, 6 falconets, 12 howitzers, 60 small mortars and 2,000 rifles.<sup>206</sup> The cannons were old, brought from Perevolochna, where trophies going back to Peter I's time were kept, from Stara Samara, and from Kamyanka.<sup>207</sup> In case of an attack, the main hope lay in the soldiers of the garrison. Two battalions of an infantry regiment and a grenadier company of 200 dragoons or Cossacks were stationed there in time of peace. In wartime, the garrison's strength was raised to three or four thousand men. Later, 500 dragoons,

<sup>203</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 582-83.

<sup>204</sup> *Arkhiu krip. sv. Yelysavety*, No. 26.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 88, 91.

<sup>206</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 208-209, 216-17; *Arkhiu krip. sv. Yelysavety*, No. 8.

<sup>207</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10304, September 30, 1754; *Arkhiu krip. sv. Yelys.* No. 47; Skal'kovskii, *Khronolog obozr...*, I, 22-3.

70 hussars of the Moldavian regiment, 200 Don Cossacks (who later were replaced by a detachment of the Moldavian regiment of the same strength) and a detachment of a "territorial militia" regiment were added to the permanent garrison of the fortress. For a time it was proposed to use a permanent unit of 200 Zaporozhian Cossacks for the defense of fortress. The Senate, however, rejected this proposal.<sup>208</sup> Only the colonists of Nova Serbiya were *never* required to contribute to the defense of the fortress.<sup>209</sup>

Thus at no time did the St. Elizabeth fortress provide a sure protection from an enemy attack, whatever the hopes of official circles may have been at the time of its foundation. In one other respect, however, it played a most prominent part in the period under discussion: it became both the administrative and economic center of the region. Administrative activities were concentrated in the fortress itself, while the economic life was carried on outside its walls.

Both the commander in chief of Nova Serbiya and the fortress commander had their headquarters in the fortress. Officers' quarters, soldiers' barracks, the main guardhouse, a jail and an armory were among other buildings inside the fortress. The construction of a large cathedral, from plans drawn by the Kievan architect Bast, was started in 1755, but it was not finished; the fortress had only one small wooden church at that time. All constructions in the fortress were of wood, and the building materials were of bad quality. Menzelius noted that the wood was rotted, so that buildings soon collapsed because of "old age."<sup>210</sup> Güldenstädt, who visited the St. Elizabeth fortress in 1776, wrote that the buildings were in bad condition, that they had been badly constructed of wood and that some of them

<sup>208</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 64, 207, 269.

<sup>209</sup> Perhaps it was here that the distrust towards the Novoserbiyans showed itself. A. S. Piščević (Pishchevich) has expressed the idea that in building the fortress "it was intended to keep in appropriate subordination the new settlers, if they multiply in the region." "Primechaniya na Novirossiiskii krai", *Kiyevskaya starina*, X, 1884, 114.

<sup>210</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelys.*, Nos. 9, 91.

were covered with "boards" (*tes*, probably meaning shingles), while others were thatched. He added that the site chosen for the fortress lacked good drinking water, a great disadvantage. Owing to the Inhul's slow movement, the waters had an unpleasant odor. The fortress, he stated, had two wells, 22 meters deep. At the outskirts, he saw many small wells, where the water had an unpleasant and stale taste.

The fortress was surrounded on all sides by suburban settlements (*forshtheady*, settlements situated on the outskirts of the fortress). There were four of these in Güldenstädt's time. The Pulkivs'ka or "Artillery" settlement lay in the north. Next to it was a part of the outlying district called Podil; it had a market place, a city hall, and an Old Believers' chapel. A third part of the suburban settlement, inhabited by Greeks, was called the "Greek settlement," and a fourth, "Permian camp," because the Perm infantry regiment was stationed there.<sup>211</sup>

It is difficult to determine with precision when each of these settlements was founded and when it received its name. It is probable that they were not yet named in the Nova Serbiya period, but had the general name of "burgesses'" (*mishchans'ki*) settlements and that the "Greek settlement" was the first to be differentiated. These suburban settlements developed with remarkable speed. By 1757, there were already 128 houses, inhabited by burgesses and merchants from various parts of the Left-Bank Ukraine and Russia.<sup>212</sup> The Greeks began to settle there about the same time.<sup>213</sup> The area about the fortress must have been inhabited for some time, otherwise it would be difficult to explain how it was possible to hold a fair in the fortress on July 24, 1754, i. e., barely a month and a half after the official date of its foundation.<sup>214</sup>

Slavyanoserbiya occupied the area of the upper Sivers'kyi Donets, Lozova, Luhan', and Bakhmut rivers. The Senate's decree

<sup>211</sup> Güldenstädt, *op. cit.*, II, 175.

<sup>212</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 10.

<sup>213</sup> V. N. Yastrebov, "Grecki v Yelisavetgrade" [Greeks in Yelisavetgrad], *Kiyevskaya starina*, VIII, 1884, 673-74.

<sup>214</sup> A. Shmidt, *Materialy...*, I, 32.

of August 3, 1754, defined Slavyanoserbiya's frontiers in the following manner: an area beginning at Bakhmut, stretching through the upper part of the Senzherivka River up to the upper parts of the Mius and Bila rivers, and ending at the river Luhan', was to be apportioned by Preradović.<sup>215</sup> In the north, Slavyanoserbiya bordered upon the Voronezh (Voronizh) province; in the west, on the area of the Slobids'ki regiments; in the south on the Zaporozhian "Free Lands"; and in the east, on the Don Cossack territories. Land was apportioned for both regiments, Šević's and Preradović's, the only specification being that the lands stretching from Bakhmut were to go to Preradović, and those stretching from the Luhan' "along the Donets and into the steppe," to Šević. The surveying was to be carried out by the colonel of the Corps of Engineers, Bibikov, in consultation with both generals.<sup>216</sup> The decree of 1754 had not been carried out for a long time. When a party of Serbs came to Bakhmut in that year, they found that the land had not yet been apportioned nor their quarters built. They had to live in the "residents' quarters" until 1755. It was not until the autumn of 1756 that Bibikov dispatched landsurveyors to begin the distribution of land to the settlers. The surveys were sent to St. Petersburg for the Military College's official confirmation, and the Serbs had to wait another year before the College finally returned the confirmed drafts and the construction of entrenchments, sixteen in each regiment, could begin.

In 1756 there were the following entrenchments in Šević's regiment: Serebryanka, Krasnyi Yar, Verkhnya, Verhunka, Pryvol'ne, Kryms'ka, Nyzhnya, Pidhorodne, Donets'k, (the future Slavyanoserbs'k), Zhovta, Kaminnyi Brid, Cherkas'ka, Khorosha, Kalynivka, Troits'ka, and Luhans'ka where two companies were stationed.<sup>217</sup> These entrenchments lay for the most part on river banks, and the old Zaporozhian winter quarters and settlements

<sup>215</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 89-90.

<sup>216</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, pp. 178-85.

<sup>217</sup> Feodosi, *Istoricheskii obzor pravoslavnoi tserkvi...*, p. 47. Preosv. Gavriil, "Otryvok iz povestvovaniya...", *op. cit.*, III, 99.

were utilized. As a result of these seizures, the regiment's area gradually advanced towards the Samara River.<sup>218</sup> In his book, *Material for an Historical-Statistical Description of the Yekaterinoslav Diocese*, so often referred to in these pages, Bishop Feodosii mentions interesting instances of this gradual occupation of Zaporozhian lands by "Slavyanoserbian." His chronology, however, has to be used with caution. Thus the Bishop says that foreigners seized the old Zaporozhian village of Pidhorodne in 1753, although, as we have seen, the earliest Serbian arrivals in Slavyanoserbiya date from 1754.<sup>219</sup> By orders of Šević and Preradović, up to one hundred Moldavian and Walachian families were settled in winter quarters and farmsteads of the Ukrainian villages of Nyzhnye on the Sivers'kyi Donets in 1754, where they founded Nyzhnya settlements.<sup>220</sup> In 1755 about one hundred families settled in the village of Kamynnyi Brid on the Luhan', already inhabited by the Zaporozhians.<sup>221</sup> The Zaporozhian settlement Veselen'ka on the Luhan' (near the Donets) was settled by Serbs and transformed into the Verhuns'kyi retrenchment in 1755.<sup>222</sup> The same thing happened to Kryms'ka Yama village, near Khans'ka Balka on the Donets. After the settlement of foreigners, it came to be called the Kryms'kyi entrenchment.<sup>223</sup> The old Zaporozhian lowlands on the Luhan' were given to Walachians in 1756. The Khoroshyi retrenchment (Kohoroshyi Yar) was built on its site.<sup>224</sup> In 1756 the Walachians, under Vakiy, company commander and recruiting agent, occupied the village of Sukhodil on the Sivers'kyi Donets. In the same year, the Walachians seized Zaporozhian homesteads and winter quarters near Kaminna Balka and on Hrytsenko's waterway in the vicinity of Lozova Pavlivka,<sup>225</sup> and Illyrians and Slovaks founded Zhovtuk on

218 Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 147.

219 Feodosi, *Materialy...*, II, 87.

220 *Ibid.*, pp. 153-54.

221 *Ibid.*, p. 133.

222 *Ibid.*, p. 136.

223 *Ibid.*, pp. 143-44.

224 *Ibid.*, p. 149.

225 *Ibid.*, p. 114.



the site of Zhovtyi Yar, which belonged to the Zaporozhians.<sup>226</sup> The Serbs colonized Kruzhylyna, Dovha, Morozivka, and Kruta Balka on the Sivers'kyi Donets in 1759.<sup>227</sup> A year later, in 1760, Moldavians and Walachians settled in the village of Pryvol'ne, in the district of Bakhmut.<sup>228</sup>

On the whole, conditions of life were worse in Slavyanoserbiya than in Nova Serbiya. In Slavyanoserbiya itself, Preradović's regiment, stationed in the vicinity of Bakhmut, was in a better situation than Šević's, to whom the region between the Donets and the Luhan' was apportioned, since in the latter area the government villages (*kazenni slobody*) and older settlements, where building materials and provisions could be purchased, were less numerous. Moreover, there were fewer forests along the Luhan'.<sup>229</sup>

The seizure of Zaporozhian lands for the use of Nova Serbiya, the Slobids'kyi regiment, and Slavyanoserbian settlers, seriously disturbed the Zaporozhian Cossacks. At first, they employed legal means of defense; they petitioned the government for protection and proved their rights to territories taken away from them and given to the colonists. Thus in 1755 they sent to the Imperial Court a delegation of three members, Danylo Hladkyi, the future camp chief Petro Kalnyshevs'kyi, and the Host's *pysar* (general secretary) Ivan Chuhuyevets'. The instructions given to the envoys stipulated that they should press for a precise statement on the lands which had been given to Nova Serbiya and petition for a new charter which would mark the territories remaining under the Host's rule. As we can see, these requests were modest and quite legal, since the Zaporozhians did not even demand the return of seized lands. The Senate, however, took a negative stand on the matter of Zaporozhian rights, declaring, in a resolution of 1755, that it was rather improbable that the Zaporozhians had exercised any real authority over territories they claimed as their own and, as for the copies of the charters of Bohdan Khmel'-

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.

<sup>229</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye..." *op. cit.*, pp. 185-193.

nyts'kyi of 1655 and the tsar's charters of 1688, that these documents could not be considered sufficient proof of their rights. On the other hand, when Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, along with the whole "Little Russian" nation, accepted Russian sovereignty, the Zaporozhian Host was also under his "direction" and there was no question of borders between Zaporizhzhya and "Little Russia" but each could settle where he wanted to. On the basis of the above considerations, the Senate refused to recognize the Zaporozhians' right to a separate territory. Nevertheless, it ordered a map and a list of all the Zaporozhian holdings to be drawn up and materials for the requested charter prepared.<sup>230</sup>

As a result of this decree, a lengthy investigation concerning the tracing of Zaporizhzhya's borders and the drawing of its map was opened. It was to continue until the destruction of Zaporizhzhya and thus never be closed. According to the orders issued by the Senate, representatives of the hetman, the St. Elizabeth fortress and the Zaporozhian Host were to meet for the purpose of tracing the frontier between the Zaporozhian holdings and Nova Serbiya, but the affair dragged on. The hetman's and Zaporozhians' representatives arrived in 1757, but the fortress' commander refused to send his surveyors.<sup>231</sup> It was not until 1758 that the surveyor Leont'yev traced the northern border of the Zaporozhian "Free Land" on the map. The border ran from Chornyi Tashlyk along the Komyshuvata Suhakleya across the Inhul and the Adzhamka, between the sources of the Kamyanka and the Beshka, and then to the Dnepr in a direct line. The Russian government, however, did not recognize this border.<sup>232</sup> The date of a new meeting of the commission composed of the representatives of Zaporizhzhya, the Slobids'kyi regiment, and the hetman was set for 1759, but this time the hetman's representatives did not appear. At this juncture, the Russian government officials declared to the Zaporozhians that a belt forty versts wide was being apportioned to the Slobids'kyi regiment. When the Host's *pysar*, Tovstyk, asked to be shown an order authorizing

<sup>230</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 155, 159.

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 172-74.

<sup>232</sup> Evarnitski, *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kozakov*, I, 37.

this measure, the commander, Murav'yov, retorted, "I myself am the order," and had him arrested.<sup>233</sup> At the same time, officers of the Slobids'kyi regiment, protected by strong Cossack detachments, were tracing the new boundary, which ran from the Saksahan' River through the mound Blyznyuky and Zhytlova Balka to the Dnepr.<sup>234</sup>

The question of tracing the border between the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" and Slavyanoserbiya arose in 1763. The task was entrusted to Major Sedyakin of the Corps of Engineers, who was to survey lands between the Orel and Samara rivers. The temper of the Zaporozhians was such, however, that their delegates warned Sedyakin not to proceed further into the steppe, for they could not guarantee his safety there.<sup>235</sup> This happened on the eve of the creation of the province of New Russia. The consequences of these events will be discussed later.

#### V. THE ADMINISTRATION OF NOVA SERBIYA AND SLAVYANOSERBIYA

The administrative conditions prevailing in Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya were unique from the very beginning. The administration of these areas was complicated, differing from the standards in other parts of the Russian Empire. Since these peculiarities and ambiguities left their imprint both on the tempo of colonization and the fate of the local inhabitants, they are worth discussing.

The decree of December 24, 1751, put the Serbian colonies under the jurisdiction of the Military College. This was natural and consistent, since these colonies were primarily military and all men living in them performed military service.<sup>236</sup> Consequently the Military College was entrusted by the Senate with the

<sup>233</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 188-91.

<sup>234</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 191-192; Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 157-58.

<sup>235</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 256, 264.

<sup>236</sup> PSZ, No. 9919, December 24, 1751.

drafting of a set of instructions for Khorvat a few days later, on December 29, 1751.<sup>237</sup>

However, this was soon changed. Nova Serbiya was made dependent directly on the Senate by the decree of 1753. The reason adduced for this decision was that "Major General Khorvat will remain under the Senate's control until he has enlisted the promised number of people in the services of Her Imperial Majesty."<sup>238</sup> In other words, the Military College was to take over only when the military colony was fully manned. Khorvat did not provide the full number of recruits and did not colonize the territory. Therefore, since the territory never left the "manning" stage, it remained under the jurisdiction of the Senate. It is clear that in view of the importance the Senate attributed to the colonization of Nova Serbiya, it did not want to abandon direct control of the territory. A remark of S. S. Pišćević deserves to be mentioned in this context. He said that Khorvat himself desired to remain under the jurisdiction of the Senate: "He prevailed upon the Senate to put him under its direct control."<sup>239</sup> There may be a grain of truth in this assertion, for Khorvat found some constant and reliable protectors among the senators, who put his personal interests above those of the state.

The Slobids'kyi Cossack regiment and the St. Elizabeth fortress, both founded at later date, were to be responsible directly to the Senate and not to the Military College. The Senate's decree had this to say on the subject: "By the terms of their privileges, Nova Serbiya and the neighboring Cossack colony are not subject to any College. Only decisions of the Governing Senate are needed in all matters."<sup>240</sup>

The Senate's sphere of influence was broad and unlimited and its proceedings attest to the vital interest in the affairs of Nova Serbiya and Slavynoserbiya. These records show how much

<sup>237</sup> PSZ, No. 9921, December 29, 1751.

<sup>238</sup> *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, fasc. XVI, p. 121.

<sup>239</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, p. 404.

<sup>240</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysavety*, No. 72.

time and attention, as compared to other business, the Senate devoted to these territories.<sup>241</sup>

Even less precise was the state of affairs in the local administration. Here the responsibilities were shared by several persons, whose weight depended to a great extent on their personalities and connections. Therefore, the struggles among them influenced all the relations in Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya during the entire period of the existence of these colonies.

In theory, the first place among local administrators belonged to the Governor General of Kiev. He exerted authority over all frontier military establishments, such as outposts, redoubts, and the entrenchment of Nova Sich, supervised the borders and quarantine posts, and "ascertained the state, designs, and movements of the Turks and Tatars."<sup>242</sup> Thus, all the territory bordering upon Zaporizhzhya, and to a certain extent Zaporizhzhya itself, was in the province of the Governor General, and Nova Serbiya cut, as it were, into the sphere of his influence. Some of the outposts and redoubts subordinated to him lay in its territory. It is true that some of these outposts later passed under the jurisdiction of the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress, but quite a number remained under the jurisdiction of the Governor General to the very end.<sup>243</sup> Moreover, Nova Serbiya was the scene of *haydamak* activity, and the struggle against the *haydamaky* was one of the duties of the Governor General of Kiev. This circumstance provided him with the opportunity of interfering in the life of these territories, since he commanded the detachments sent out to Nova Serbiya to suppress the *haydamak* movement. Thus, in 1752, the Governor General of Kiev dispatched 500 men, led by Lieutenant Colonel von Finiks (Fon Finiks), "to root out the *haydamaky*" in the region of Tsybuliv, Novomyrhorod, Arkhangel's'k and Hard.<sup>244</sup> According to his instruc-

<sup>241</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*. Vols. VIII-XV.

<sup>242</sup> A. A. Andriyevski, *Istoricheskiye materialy*, Fasc. VIII, p. 75; V. Shcherbina, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-147; and his, "Dva Kyivs'ki general-gubernatory pershovyi polovyny XVIII st." [Two governor generals of Kiev in the first half of the 18th cent.] *Naukovyi zbirnyk*, Kiev, 1924, pp. 84-86.

<sup>243</sup> KTsADA, *Fond kiyevsk. gub. kantsel.*, No. 9148.

<sup>244</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 14696.

tions, the Governor General of Kiev conducted all diplomatic negotiations with Turkey, the Crimea, Poland, and, of course, Zaporizhzhya. This made the dependence of the local Nova Serbiya authorities on the Governor General even closer and aggravated the constant friction between him and Khorvat. Khorvat strove by all means to shake off the control of the Governor General in these matters and was quite successful.<sup>245</sup> The Governor General did not confine himself to these spheres of influence but sought to broaden them. For instance, he interfered with the construction of the St. Elizabeth fortress, the appointment of the commander of the Slobids'kyi regiment, and so forth.<sup>246</sup> The colonization itself was under his control, since all emigrants were first directed to Kiev where they took their oath. Then they were assigned to the three commanders, Khorvat, Šević and Pre-radović, if not previously bound to one of them by contract.<sup>247</sup>

It should be kept in mind that the "Instructions" given to Glebov made the Governor General of Kiev the final arbiter of appeals from Nova Serbiya. According to the "Instructions" the commander in chief and Khorvat were "to administer the law together, and consult the chancery of the Governor General of Kiev, if necessary."<sup>248</sup>

Such was the theory. In practice, many changes occurred in the situation. The extent of the Governor General's influence in the affairs of Nova Serbiya varied in accordance with his personality. On the other hand, this influence depended on the weight carried by Khorvat, whose strength increased with every year. When General M. I. Leont'yev, a competent, influential and authoritative Governor General, died in 1753, a new Governor was not appointed for several years and the Vice-Governor I. I. Kostyuryn acted as Governor General of Kiev.<sup>249</sup> When he

<sup>245</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 484, 515.

<sup>246</sup> *Ibid.*, XII 194, 484; KT<sub>s</sub>ADA, *Fond kiyevsk. gub. kants.*, No. 14969.

<sup>247</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 403.

<sup>248</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9935, February 3, 1752.

<sup>249</sup> Andriyevski, *Istoricheskiye materialy*, fasc. VIII, p. 76; Shcherbina, "Kiyevskiy voyevody..." *op. cit.*, pp. 234-35; and "Dva Kyivs'ki general-gubernatory..." *op. cit.*, p. 86.

left for St. Petersburg in 1758, the duties of the office were in the hands of *General en chef* Lopukhin, later relieved by Major General Chicherin.<sup>250</sup> This state of affairs lasted till 1762 and coincided with a considerable decrease of the Governor General's influence on Nova Serbiya. In 1758, for example, Khorvat obtained the right to receive settlers directly from abroad, bypassing the Governor General, and to distribute them between Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya himself. He also was authorized, with some reservations, to carry on diplomatic correspondence with his neighbors.<sup>251</sup>

In 1762, *General en chef* I. F. Glebov, the former Commander in Chief of Nova Serbiya, was appointed Governor General of Kiev. This man knew Nova Serbiya's state of affairs and the relations prevailing among its prominent personalities thoroughly. With the appointment of Glebov, the situation changed once more. He became the virtual superior of Nova Serbiya and took full charge of affairs there.<sup>252</sup>

There were three representatives of authority on the territory of Nova Serbiya proper, the commander in chief, the commander of the Nova Serbiya corps, and the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress. We shall discuss the functions of each of them separately.

The office of the commander in chief of Nova Serbiya was created at the time of the drafting of the original project for the organization of Nova Serbiya settlements. The Senate decreed on December 26 and 27, 1751 that "inasmuch as the commander in chief [supervising] the settlement of the aforementioned nations should be a reliable person with a general's rank... [the Senate] requests the confirmation of Her Imperial Majesty for entrusting this settlement" to Major General Cherntsov. However, the affair was reconsidered by the Senate and the Military

<sup>250</sup> Andriyevski, *Istoricheskiye materialy*, fasc. VIII, p. 71; *Kyyiv's'kyi Tsentral'nyi Arkhiv Starodavnikh Aktiv*, Kiev, 1929, p. 189.

<sup>251</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 340-49; XI, 31-3; Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr...*, I, 28.

<sup>252</sup> Andriyevski, *Istoricheskiye materialy*, fasc. VIII, p. 78; *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 194, 432.

College on January 2, 1752, and it was decided that the settlement should be supervised by "such a member of the corps of generals who was versed in engineering science." Therefore, instead of Cherntsov, the candidacy of Major General Ivan Fedorovich Glebov was put forward.<sup>253</sup>

Although according to the Senate's decree Glebov was to draft instructions for himself, his functions as commander in chief were very vaguely outlined.<sup>254</sup> The instructions did not draw a clear dividing line between Glebov's and Khorvat's spheres of activity. Many functions were to be carried out "by mutual consent and good will," a circumstance which obviously would lead to continuous friction and misunderstanding. Broadly speaking, Glebov's task amounted to allotting lands for settlers together with Khorvat, furthering the cause of colonization and seeing that the colonists from abroad belonged to "authorized nations" only. When in 1763 the Senate authorized Khorvat to admit Bulgarian and Moldavian settlers living in Poland, it enjoined both him and Glebov to watch that no Poles moved in with these colonists.<sup>255</sup> Justice was to be administered by the commander in chief and Khorvat conjointly. Jurisdiction over the military belonged to Khorvat alone; jurisdiction over the civilians to both of them, pending the organization of the garrison chancery. In especially difficult cases, they were to "get in touch" with the provincial chancery of Kiev.<sup>256</sup>

In addition to the cases in which the commander in chief was to act together with Khorvat, there were others in which he acted independently, making no attempt to coordinate his actions with him. While he was entrusted with diplomatic correspondence, it was said that Khorvat, "not carrying on diplomatic correspondence of his own, should notify the commander, Major General Glebov." The decision to have such business passed on to Glebov was quite correct, since Khorvat was a foreigner and only recently naturalized. The Senate skillfully justified this

<sup>253</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 406-407, 415.

<sup>254</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9935, February 3, 1752.

<sup>255</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 476, 493, 595.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 79-81, 10, 38-40.



transfer of the right to carry on diplomatic correspondence by the observation that Khorvat, a newcomer, might become the victim of some misunderstanding. However, Khorvat was offended and wrote to the Senate that the transfer of foreign correspondence to Glebov was causing "difficulties and disorder" in the business with which he was entrusted. Moreover, Khorvat complained, his correspondence with Glebov on the subject of admitting new settlers consumed too much of his time. The Senate, not wishing to offend Khorvat, decreed that the task of foreign correspondence should be divided between them. Secret and important matters were to be dispatched by Glebov, while Khorvat retained the right to correspond in matters of lesser importance, especially those concerning Nova Serbiya.<sup>257</sup>

The commander in chief also administered the so-called "Novoserbiya Fund," i. e., the sums destined for Nova Serbiya, and in this respect exerted a control over Khorvat. On the whole, relations between Glebov and Khorvat, outlined so vaguely in the instruction and in a series of Senate decrees were those between a representative of state interests and a little-known foreigner, to whom, however, extremely broad powers had been given at the very beginning of his activity. That, at least, is how Khorvat understood the situation and immediately he began a struggle for independent action. When the "service record," (*formulyer*) mentioning the appointment of Glebov as the commander in chief of Nova Serbiya, was read to him at the Senate meeting in 1752, Khorvat asked for a change to be made on this point, since, he maintained, the "nations" which came with him or would come later might misunderstand it by reason of their foreign origin. The Senate consented to give the wording a vague turn, and to change the passage to read, "persons appointed by us for this colony by our and Khorvat's mutual consent." Of course, there was more to the matter than the wording of the "service record." The misunderstandings between Khorvat and Glebov started on the very first days of their common activity. Expecting a large number of settlers, Khorvat demanded two

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 469.

thousand Cossacks be sent to build fortifications, while Glebov reported to the Senate that it was hard for him to imagine how even one thousand Cossacks could be kept busy. Khorvat required that the construction of storehouses and armories be started immediately, while Glebov wrote that these buildings were superfluous, since no ammunition had been allotted by the state. Khorvat insisted on having barracks built rapidly, and Glebov informed the Senate that they were not necessary on account of the "scarcity" of Serbs.<sup>258</sup> Faced with these contradictory reports, the Senate ordered Khorvat and Glebov to come to a mutual agreement and more than once it was to pronounce such Solomon's judgments, ignoring, whether deliberately or unwittingly, Khorvat's behavior.

The memoirs of S. S. Piščević reflect the view of Novoserbian contemporaries on Glebov's role. In their opinion, Glebov did not represent the government nor did he supervise Khorvat; he was attached to Khorvat by the Senate, "for sundry purposes and for the keeping of the treasury. . . [he] had to confer with Khorvat on all matters touching upon the colonization."<sup>259</sup> These contemporaries reduced Glebov's role almost to that of an aide-de-camp with a general's rank attached to Khorvat. It is possible that this was more than Piščević's personal interpretation and that this view corresponded to Khorvat's actual position.

There was one more domain where the commander in chief was independent of Khorvat. While the separation of the local "population not covered by decree," its eviction from the Nova Serbiya territory, and its organization into the Slobids'kyi regiment went on, these people gradually came under the jurisdiction of the commander in chief. Also under his control was the St. Elizabeth fortress with all the inhabitants of the civilian settlements, the garrison, and the regular and irregular army units stationed on the territory of Nova Serbiya, i. e., "territorial militia" detachments, infantry and dragoon regiments and the like, as well as the units of the "Little Russian" Cossacks who were

<sup>258</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 425-26, 706-707.

<sup>259</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye. . ." *op. cit.*, p. 176.

there temporarily. The correspondence concerning these Cossacks was carried on by Glebov directly with the hetman.<sup>200</sup>

Their duties seem to have been divided in the following manner: the commander in chief controlled Khorvat, who in turn supervised all the foreign population; Glebov had direct control over the original population of the region.

This state of affairs did not last long; the diarchy came to an end in 1756. Glebov received a new position in St. Petersburg and no one was appointed to his former office. Part of his functions was taken over by the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress, who, however, did not possess an authority comparable to Glebov's. Khorvat, therefore, extended his powers at the expense of those of the commander in chief. By 1757 he received the title of "Commander in Chief of the Nova Serbiya Corps" and became the absolute ruler of Nova Serbiya.<sup>201</sup>

In 1759, however, in view of the movements of Tatar "hordes" which endangered the southern frontier, the Senate subordinated Nova Serbiya, the St. Elizabeth fortress, and the Slobids'kyi regiment to the commander of the armies stationed in the Ukraine, *General en chef* P. N. Streshnev. Streshnev, "jointly with the Commandant (*Oberkomendant*) of Kiev, Major General Lopukhin," was to "give instructions" to Khorvat and to the fortress' commander, Yust.<sup>202</sup> The situation, viewed at first as temporary, dragged on, and in 1761 the Senate, accepting the proposal of the Military College, appointed Streshnev commander in chief of Nova Serbiya *pro tempore*. A year later, Lieutenant General Prince Meshcherski was made commander in chief of Nova Serbiya and of Nova Serbiya corps, and this brought the period of Khorvat's power to an end.<sup>203</sup> Prince Meshcherski was commissioned to make a census of Nova Serbiya, but died in September 1762 before completing this task.<sup>204</sup> Nova Serbiya, thus bereft of its commander, passed under the jurisdiction of

<sup>200</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 96.

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 371.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 1-2.

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 176-77; *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, filc 47, No. 965.

<sup>204</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XI, 268-69.

the Governor General of Kiev, an office held since May 1762 by I. F. Glebov. In 1762-3 the commanders in chief of Nova Serbiya change in rapid succession: first, Lieutenant General Lachinov, then, Major General Shetnov, who did not even have the time to leave for Nova Serbiya; Major General Naryshkin, appointed on January 1, 1763, held the office for less than six months, and finally, from June 1763 on, Lieutenant General A. P. Mel'gunov, who was commander in chief of Nova Serbiya and the Slobids'ka colony under the Governor General of Kiev.<sup>265</sup> Mel'gunov's aid was Brigadier Zorych, "an expert on emigrants. . . and the customs of foreign people."<sup>266</sup> Mel'gunov, the last commander in chief of Nova Serbiya, was entrusted with the task of carrying out a reform which was to change a region with a peculiar and complicated administrative system into a Russian province.

It is not clear whether the commander in chief was assisted by a special executive organ, i. e., a chancery. The documents point only to the existence of a special "commission," founded in 1752 for the colonization of Nova Serbiya with Serbians and other "Orthodox people." This commission administered the entire "Novoserbiya Fund" and was under the commander in chief. It was composed of a president, an army finance officer (*Kriegszahlmeister*), and, before the latter's appointment, the captain of one of the regiments of the Ukrainian corps. During the absence of the commander in chief, the commission was responsible to the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress.

This fortress commander ranked second in the administrative hierarchy of the region. He acted as commander in chief in the latter's absence and whenever the office was vacant, as was the case after the recall of I. F. Glebov. He played a fairly important part in the region, since his functions were broad and many; he commanded all the military forces of the region, including the garrison of the fortress, and had jurisdiction over all those outposts where Cossack detachments and quarantine points were

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 310-11, 318; *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 49, No. 1062, and file 52, No. 1146.

<sup>266</sup> *PSZ*, No. 11861, June 11, 1763; *Senatskii arkhiv*, XIII, 250.

established.<sup>267</sup> Thus, part of the functions of the Governor General of Kiev passed over to the fortress commander, inasmuch as the latter gained control over some outposts, e. g., Myshuryn Rih, which passed from the jurisdiction of the Perevolochna commander to that of the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress in 1753.<sup>268</sup> Moreover, detachments which were stationed in Nova Serbiya temporarily, such as the Meshcheryaks of the Orenburg region, the Kazan Tatars, one thousand Don Cossacks, units of the Russian army and the like, were under the fortress' commander.<sup>269</sup> The commander was responsible to the commander in chief of Nova Serbiya and the Governor General of Kiev, or the commandant of Kiev, who replaced the latter in purely military matters.<sup>270</sup>

In addition to his command over all military units of Nova Serbiya, the fortress commander ruled over the civilian population which lived on the territory under his control. These were the inhabitants of the fortress settlement and the Slobids'kyi regiment, and constituted Ukrainians and Great Russians "not covered by decree" who had to leave the territory of Nova Serbiya. Many settlements of Old Believers belonged in this category.<sup>271</sup>

The fortress commander replaced the commander in chief in the latter's absence.<sup>272</sup> He also replaced Khorvat, e. g., when the latter was summoned to appear before the Senate in connection with Perich's denunciation.<sup>273</sup> Thus, the fortress commander was a natural substitute for the commander in chief when this office was vacant. At such a time, the fortress commander, together with Khorvat, was the sole representative of the government. He even carried on diplomatic correspondence, a practice against which the Vice Governor Kostyuryn, acting temporarily for the Gov-

<sup>267</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 64-5.

<sup>268</sup> KTsADA, *Fond kiyevsk. gub. kantsel.*, No. 9148; *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysavety*, No. 3.; *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 156-57.

<sup>269</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 1.

<sup>270</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 131, 187, 186.

<sup>271</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 12; *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, pp. 260-262.

<sup>272</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 241.

<sup>273</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 313.

ernor General of Kiev, protested.<sup>274</sup> Also the supervision of the "Colonization Commission" and the "Novoserbiya Fund" passed to the fortress commander. Now Khorvat had to turn to him for money; in 1758, he requested 200 rubles from the commander for the maintenance of the regiment which he was forming. To give another example, the Main Chancery asked the fortress commander to issue an allowance to the arkhimandrite, Dobrashevich, amounting to 300 rubles per year.<sup>275</sup> The commander issued passports to those who wanted to leave Nova Serbiya. Even the officers of Khorvat's regiment had to approach him in such matters.<sup>276</sup>

Khorvat had something of a competitor in the person of the fortress commander, or at least somebody who restricted the freedom of his movements. Conflicts between the two were thus unavoidable, and, in fact, occurred continuously, although the Senate sided with Khorvat for the most part. In 1755 the Senate ordered Brigadier Glebov "not to interfere with the internal affairs of the regiments" and expressed its full confidence in Khorvat and the certitude that all of his dispositions were aimed at the furthering of Her Imperial Majesty's interests.<sup>277</sup> A new clash occurred between Khorvat and the fortress commander, Yust, in 1758. They accused each other of supporting the *haydamaky*. Again, the Senate firmly sided with Khorvat and decreed that "from now on, no denunciations directed against Khorvat should be accepted."<sup>278</sup> The relations between Khorvat and the fortress commander were particularly tense during Brigadier M. A. Murav'yov's tenure of office. Murav'yov was an energetic and decisive person, one not only inclined to defend his prerogatives but to overstep them. It may be recalled that he answered the request of the Zaporozhian representatives that they be shown the Imperial order, by saying, "I myself am the order."<sup>279</sup> He de-

274 *Arkhiv Zaporozhkoï Sichi, Opys. materiyaliv*, Kiev, 1931, p. 15.

275 *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. ve.

276 *Ibid.*, No. 58.

277 *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX 339.

278 *Ibid.*, X, 557-65.

279 *Skal'kovski, Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 188-91.

fended the interests of the Ukrainian population subject to him from the encroachments of Khorvat, who imagined that this population existed solely for the sake of the Serbs. Murav'yov's protection was not limited to the Ukrainians. In his struggle with Khorvat, he gladly gave shelter to all those whom Khorvat had wronged. Khorvat finally obtained the dismissal of Murav'yov. The Senate gave the following reasons for its decision to dismiss him: First, Murav'yov did not prohibit the Poles from constructing a stronghold opposite the Novomyrhorod entrenchment (this happened in Khorvat's absence). Second, he admitted a Major Shmit into the fortress, who had denounced Khorvat for allegedly demanding exorbitant sums not justified by documents. Third, and most important, Murav'yov sought to appropriate possessions given to Nova Serbiya for the use of the Cossacks settled in the vicinity of the fortress.<sup>280</sup> Murav'yov was summoned before the Senate for explanations and replaced by the State Councilor G. P. Tolstoi, who was instructed to "be in accord" with Khorvat. An investigation of this affair showed, however, that Murav'yov had not been guilty of any irregularities and he was reinstated in his position as commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress.<sup>281</sup> But Khorvat did not give up. In 1762 he again reported to the Senate that Murav'yov required "exorbitant tributes and taxes" from the population subject to him, and, for that reason these people fled the Slobids'ka colony. Khorvat also charged Murav'yov with receiving fugitives from Nova Serbiya and pointed to his "spending the sums of the Novoserbiya Fund improperly." Murav'yov was dismissed for the second time in April 1762 and sent to Kiev for questioning; Staff Officer Frizel' was appointed fortress commander *pro tempore*. Khorvat in this period attained his greatest power, being appointed commander of all the colonies.<sup>282</sup> Again, the investigation did not disclose anything criminal in Murav'yov's activity. He was reinstated in July of the same year, and the happy star of Khorvat began to set.

<sup>280</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, 367-72; *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 21, No. 392; file 38, No. 825.

<sup>281</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XI, 368-69, 457-58.

<sup>282</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 176-77.

Within a short period of time a considerable number of persons held the office of the fortress commander. Between 1753 and 1757 it was occupied by Brigadier A. I. Glebov; between 1757 and March 1758 by the commander of the Perm Dragoon regiment, Gur'yev, who acted as temporary fortress commander;<sup>283</sup> between April 1758 and the end of that year, by Major General F. I. Yust; then, until 1764, by Brigadier M. A. Murav'yov, who was replaced temporarily by State Councilor G. P. Tolstoi some time between 1760 and January 1761 and once more by Frizel' between April and July of 1762.<sup>284</sup>

At first, the commander did not have an executive organ of his own. Until 1754, he had only the "Chancery of His Honour the Brigadier and Commander of the St. Elizabeth Fortress."<sup>285</sup> This chancery was transformed into a garrison chancery at some later date, probably in the second half of 1757, although the formation of such a chancery was already foreseen in the decree of December 29, 1751.<sup>286</sup> The members of the chancery were: the commander; Councilor Yakovlev, the finance officer; the auditor, Popov; the collegiate registrar, Veshnyakov; two office secretaries (*Kantselyarist*); an assistant secretary (*pidkantselyarist*); a clerk; two copyists; the physician, P. Volkov; an interpreter, F. Semenov; and the garrison's quartermaster, Yegor Arapov—the career of this cartographer of the Southern Ukraine began in this way.<sup>287</sup> According to instructions given to Glebov, the garrison chancery was to "administer justice to non-serving people." The "Military Judiciary Commission of Nova Serbiya for Serbian and Other People" was formed later.<sup>288</sup>

In addition to the members of these commissions, there were other people on the fortress' staff, e. g., the engineers responsible for the construction works in the fortress and in the entire region;

<sup>283</sup> *Ibid.*, XIII, 433.

<sup>284</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 445; XI, 160; 414, 457-60; XII, 12.

<sup>285</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, Nos. 3, 69.

<sup>286</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9921, December 29, 1751.

<sup>287</sup> *Arkhiv. krip. sv. Yelys.*, Nos. 15, 57.

<sup>288</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 15, 80.



they built entrenchments, quarantine posts, etc. This group was headed by the Colonel of the Corps of Engineers, Menzelius, the chief builder of the St. Elizabeth fortress, who had four engineers and nine technicians (*Konduktory*) under him.<sup>289</sup> Some other places of the region, such as Novomyrhorod, had engineering units of their own.

The third representative of the administration in Nova Serbiya was her "founder," Major General (later, Lieutenant General) Ivan Samoylovich Khorvat, commander of the Hussar regiment and, from 1757, commander of the Nova Serbiya corps. The part he played was not limited to his commanding the regiment or the corps, for, at the same time he was the head of the whole territory on which the corps was settled. His power differed from that of an ordinary commander in that he was not only appointed regimental commander for life, but also granted the right to pass this office on to his children and grandchildren. In addition to the command over his regiment, he was even the commander of the Pandur regiment, which had a commander of its own, and from 1755 on, of the Novomyrhorod garrison, formed from three hundred Vlaks, Serbs, Bulgarians, Macedonians and Montenegrins. The strength of this garrison rose to five-hundred men in 1759.<sup>290</sup>

The authority and weight carried by Khorvat with the Court and the Senate increased with every year, and his power in Nova Serbiya grew correspondingly. In Nova Serbiya, Khorvat swept everything from his way which might prove an obstacle to his designs. It is noteworthy that even Commander in Chief Glebov, who had full powers and the confidence of his government, made only a very limited use of his rights of control and avoided a struggle with Khorvat. When Colonel Perich submitted his first detailed denunciation of Khorvat in 1755, Glebov did not take

<sup>289</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 26.

<sup>290</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9919, December 24, 1751; No. 10488 December 4, 1756; No. 10933, March 3, 1759. Pišćević wrote, "He was credited with the entire settlement of these people, and he, as the first settler, became their commander." See, N. Popov, "Voyennye poseleniya serbov..." *op. cit.*, VI, 605.

part in the affair.<sup>291</sup> Perich wrote in his "petition" that Khorvat was violating "charters and decrees," accepting people of "prohibited nations," and requiring the population to work for him without compensation. He also, Perich continued, assigned the excellent Kryukiv entrenchment to his son, seized meadows, leased out the business of provisioning Nova Serbiya which caused a rise in prices, and so forth. The Senate summoned Khorvat for questioning, but he successfully refuted all accusations leveled against him and turned the affair against Perich. The Senate acknowledged that, since the colonization of the region had been entrusted to Khorvat, he was free to "act according to his best judgment." It was up to him to assign the entrenchment to his son or to lease out certain functions. The crime of *lèse-majesté* was viewed with utmost severity in these times, but it proved easy for Khorvat to escape even this accusation. Perich testified that Khorvat had stuck Her Imperial Majesty's decree into his boot leg; the Senate explained that this was a custom current among the Serbs. Perich had finally to declare his denunciation to be false and ask Khorvat's pardon in public.<sup>292</sup> Khorvat's authority increased even more after this affair.

In the same year, the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress, Glebov, made another, but equally unsuccessful, attempt to curtail Khorvat's powers. The Senate reprimanded Glebov and forbade him to interfere with those regiments' internal affairs" in the future, adding that Khorvat's "instructions and orders were found to have been made in the best interests of the emigrants. . . and with a sufficient regard for upholding Her Imperial Majesty's advantage."<sup>293</sup>

Naturally enough, these events sufficiently guaranteed a further increase in Khorvat's power. Commander in Chief Glebov

<sup>291</sup> Perić had served earlier in the old Serbian (Staroserbs'kiy) regiment and, at Khorvat's request, transferred to the latter's regiment. At first he enjoyed Khorvat's great confidence. See, *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX 37-8; Popov, ed., "Izvestiye. . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 198-201.

<sup>292</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 37-9, 313, 323-27, 332-33, 340-51; Popov, ed., "Izvestiye. . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 199-201.

<sup>293</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 339.

was recalled from Nova Serbiya in 1756—Khorvat may have contributed to this measure—and given an insignificant appointment in St. Petersburg, first in the Artillery Command and later in the Corps of Engineers.<sup>294</sup> With Glebov thus eliminated, Khorvat's stature continued to grow, and he was appointed "Commander in Chief of the Nova Serbiya Corps" in 1757. The confidence he enjoyed was so complete that even such a compromising affair as the accusation of backing the *haydamaky* did not shake his position, although the factual evidence was unassailable. Again, the Senate protected Khorvat and decreed that no faith should be given the testimony against him, since it was put forth by "persons found guilty of crime." Only the College of Foreign Affairs expressed its wish that "peace should be maintained by all means and Khorvat's activities, supervised," and advised the appointment "of a person of Great Russian origin, holding a rank equal to, or higher than, Khorvat's," for Nova Serbiya. The Senate, however, rejected this proposal, "in order not to offend him [Khorvat] by such a measure."<sup>295</sup> It also disregarded the statement of the Military College that the maintenance costs of Khorvat's regiments were excessive.<sup>296</sup>

When the office of commander in chief became vacant as a result of I. F. Glebov's transfer to St. Petersburg, Khorvat started the struggle with succeeding commanders of the St. Elizabeth fortress, who retained their rule over the Slobids'ki settlements. Having gained the victory over the first commander, Glebov, Khorvat continued to fight with his successors, Major General Yust and Brigadier Murav'yov. He was victorious twice over the latter, since Murav'yov was twice dismissed from his office. In 1762 Khorvat prevailed upon higher authorities to entrust him with the command of the Slobids'kyi regiment as well, thus becoming the sole ruler of the region for a time. As already stated, Khorvat gradually took over the rights of the Governor General

<sup>294</sup> *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'* [Russian Biographical Dictionary], Moscow 1916, V, 358.

<sup>295</sup> Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 1028; *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 565; Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 149.

<sup>296</sup> *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, fasc. XVI, pp. 122-23.

of Kiev, such as that of carrying on correspondence with the neighboring foreign powers and assigning new immigrants to Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya. This latter gain, however, was by no means lasting, since he had constant conflicts with Preradović and Šević over these immigrants.

Pišćević has left a most vivid description of Khorvat's broad use of his powers. He refers to the latter as "our absolute and tyrannical ruler" and, sometimes with indignation, sometimes with envy for Khorvat's versatility, quotes many episodes, shocking even to contemporaries, who were accustomed to the crude mores of their epoch and the low regard for the rights of the individual. For many years, Khorvat provided the Senate with false reports on the number of emigrants he brought with him. He appointed his sons, still minors, to responsible positions, promoted them because they allegedly brought people to Nova Serbiya, received payments for "dead souls," beat up officers for insubordination, had a crowd of soldiers, who clamored for pay, shot, and so forth.<sup>297</sup> Of course, one might be inclined to attribute a part of these accusations to envy and the pique of Piščević, who never became reconciled with Khorvat; however an official document on the Khorvat affair, the proceedings of the investigation, shows that reality closely resembled the picture drawn by Piščević.

In 1759 Khorvat, then at the peak of his power, was attacked by Major Shmit, one of his collaborators. For a time, Shmit had headed the chancery of the Nova Serbiya corps; later, he presided over the "Commission of Accounts." Thus, he was a witness of, and participant in, Khorvat's administration of the region. Piščević singles Shmit out as the only honest man in Khorvat's whole gang. In Piščević's own words, "the Commission of Accounts was the bottomless pit of Khorvat's thievery." It administered all funds assigned for Nova Serbiya's needs. Here, the same items were paid for ten times over, without receipts and orders ever being presented.<sup>298</sup> Shmit started the affair through legal chan-

<sup>297</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye....," *op. cit.*, pp. 405.

<sup>298</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 404, 407.

nels, submitting a report to Khorvat on accounting irregularities, errors in handling financial business, and so forth, in 1759. Khorvat took personal offense and had a warrant issued for Shmit's arrest. Shmit escaped. Khorvat started a counter-offensive, denouncing Shmit and all persons who had dealings with him, Murav'yov, Colonel Odobash, and others, to the Senate. Murav'yov's dismissal was a consequence of this report of Khorvat's.<sup>299</sup>

This time, however, Khorvat's victory was of short duration. The Senate took a different attitude from that adopted at the time of the Perich affair and appointed Colonel Spichinski to inspect and revise the affairs of Nova Serbiya.<sup>300</sup> Spichinski arrived in 1761 and began collecting evidence on the situation in the whole region. Naturally enough, the investigation centered around Khorvat's person. His arbitrariness, embezzlements, his many irregularities committed in the process of colonization, his false reports to the Senate, and his venality, all came to light. In his letter to the Senate, Khorvat remarked ironically that Shmit and his "associates would not have failed to report" his mistakes, so that Spichinski's presence was superfluous. He forgot that it was precisely Shmit who started the whole affair. Khorvat maintained that far from having derived any benefit from this activity in Nova Serbiya, he "invested all his fortune in the settlement and deprived his children of possessions due them from their fathers and their forefathers."<sup>301</sup> Facts, however, belied all Khorvat's arguments and showed that he did not disdain to make profits even on such trifles as the purchase of horses for the regiment. A Lieutenant Chorba "earned" 120 rubles in this transaction and paid Khorvat off with 40 rubles.<sup>302</sup> Khorvat squandered money right and left. He even tried to offer purses full of *chervontsy* to the valet of Peter III and his adjutant, Hudovych, but they declined the gift and the affair could not be hushed up.<sup>303</sup>

The commission investigating the Khorvat affair began its

<sup>299</sup> *Fond novoserbsk korpusa*, file 19, No. 298.

<sup>300</sup> *Ibid.*, file 21, No. 392; file 22, No. 408; file 38, No. 825.

<sup>301</sup> *Ibid.*, file 38, No. 825; file 45, Nos. 911, 912, 928; file 59, Nos. 1402, 1414.

<sup>302</sup> *Ibid.*, file 53, No. 1166.

<sup>303</sup> Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 1487.

work in the St. Elizabeth fortress in 1763. The Governor General of Kiev, I. F. Glebov, and the Commander in Chief of Nova Serbiya, Lieutenant General Mel'gunov, were among its members. The entire Main Chancery of the Nova Serbiya corps was summoned to the St. Elizabeth fortress, and all those in possession of pertinent evidence were encouraged to file complaints. In Pišćević's words, "everything flared up, and complaints began to arrive from all quarters, like so many lightning strokes."<sup>304</sup> Everybody was complaining, officers, settlers, merchants, clergy, local inhabitants. It seemed that there was no one in Nova Serbiya who had not been offended or wronged by Khorvat.

For a long time Khorvat did not abandon the hope that the affair would take a favorable turn. He assailed the Senate with complaints of alleged irregularities in the investigation and accused Glebov and other members of the commission of prejudice against him and of various abuses. He obtained the transfer of the investigation to St. Petersburg, where he expected the support of his old friends and where he promised to disclose "strange and astonishing things, done in contravention to Imperial legislation."<sup>305</sup> But the attitude towards Khorvat had changed radically. He found no more support in the Senate, the investigation was closed within a year, and Khorvat sentenced to death by hanging, which was later commuted to banishment to Vologda. His possessions were confiscated, and the proceeds were to be used primarily for the repayment of sums he owed that state. His other creditors were to be indemnified from the remainder.<sup>306</sup>

As commander of the Nova Serbiya settlement, Khorvat had a chancery, or staff; its initial setup remains unclear. Later, in 1759, when the Nova Serbiya corps was formed and Khorvat granted the title of corps commander, a new institution was formed, called the Main Chancery of the Nova Serbiya corps.<sup>307</sup> Ini-

<sup>304</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, 440; *Fond novoserbsk korpusa*, file 50, No. 1393; file 55, No. 1263; file 59, No. 1402, 1404.

<sup>305</sup> KTsADA, *Fond kiyevsk. gub. kants.*, No. 6313; Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr...*, I, 62; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 1487 and VI, 106.

<sup>306</sup> KTsADA, *Fond Kiyev. gub. kants.*, No. 6313; *Fond novoserbsk korpusa*, file 97, No. 2470.

<sup>307</sup> PSZ, No. 10933, March, 3, 1759.

tially, it was composed of Khorvat as its chairman, the chief of the Novomyrhorod garrison as its vice-chairman, and higher officers, one from each regiment, the latter changing every year. An auditor, a secretary and several clerks completed the staff of the chancery, whose membership was subsequently increased, so that it comprised six staff and company officers (*oberofitser*). The signatures reveal the presence of the following persons in the chancery: Lieutenant Colonel Anton Khorvat and secretary Daniel Ivanov, in 1759; Lieutenant Colonel Grigori Bulatsel', First Major Lazar Serezlyi, Lieutenant Colonel Anton Khorvat, chief auditor Maksim Nelyubov, in 1760; Anton and Joseph Khorvat and Maksim Nelyubov, at the beginning of 1761; Colonel Luka Stanislavski, Court Councilor Georgi Akatsatov, and secretary Daniel Vaida, at the end of the year.<sup>308</sup>

At first glance, it might seem that the creation of this chancery was a positive step, in that it brought a change into the order of things in the administration of Nova Serbiya. Such an opinion would be erroneous, however. It appears from the list of names quoted above that Khorvat's closest relatives and people from his suite were among the members of the commission. Anton and Joseph (later, Governor General of New Russia) were Khorvat's sons; Grigori Bulatsel' and Vaida belonged to his entourage.

Pišćević has characterized this chancery precisely. Khorvat, he wrote, organized it after the model of a college and obtained a decree of the Senate enjoining "all other colleges and government offices to carry on correspondence with it." The chancery was responsible to the Senate. It was divided into three departments: military affairs, frontier affairs and "internal and economic affairs of the settlement." The meeting took place in a hall furnished with a table covered with red cloth and a mirror. All would have been well, Pišćević writes, but for Khorvat. In his capacity as chairman, he appointed his sons, boys of school age—they were thirteen to fourteen years old—as members of the chancery, and official papers were brought to school for their signature. Khorvat disregarded the decisions of the chancery. If he

<sup>308</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, Nos. 26, 49.

was displeased with them, he tore up the orders and dictated new ones to the secretary.<sup>309</sup>

The chancery's sphere of influence was very broad. It covered the whole life of the region, legal, civil, and military affairs. In civilian affairs the chancery was responsible to the Senate and in military, to the Military College. The chancery's duties were outlined in the following way: "the maintaining and dispatching of all military, civilian, political and economic affairs, as well as all types of internal and external ordinances." Regimental chanceries turned to the Main Chancery in all circumstances, such as the allotment of land to officers, seizure and return of deserters from the Slobids'kyi regiment, appropriation of money for the construction of a bridge across the Vys', and so forth.<sup>310</sup>

At a later date, the judiciary functions of the chancery were taken over by a special tribunal, which was composed (1761) of Colonel Tsvetynovich and First Major Lazar Serezlyi (the court's presidents), chief auditor Nelyubov, Ivan and Joseph Khorvat, and Grigori Bulatsel'. Thus the membership of the court overlapped that of the Main Chancery to a considerable extent.<sup>311</sup>

Khorvat also had a "Field Chancery of His Excellency the Lieutenant General, Commander of the Hussar Regiments of the Nova Serbiya Corps and the Chancery of Permanent Colonel I. S. Khorvat of the First Hussar Regiment," but its functions were unclear.<sup>312</sup>

The Commission of Accounts has already been mentioned; it controlled accounts, estimates, and, generally speaking, all financial operations, such as appropriation of monies for provisions, fodder, ammunition, etc. Shmit's description is our only source for its functioning.<sup>313</sup>

Of course, one should not expect to find at the side of Khorvat, the founder of Nova Serbiya, any organized community life, one which expressed the collective wishes of the regiment's officials.

<sup>309</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, pp. 376, 404-05.

<sup>310</sup> *Fond novoserbsk korpusa*, file 174, No. 365, 266; file 21, No. 380; file 31, No. 587.

<sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*, file 35, No. 678.

<sup>312</sup> *PSZ*, No. 9921, December 29, 1751.

<sup>313</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, p. 107.



Therefore, any trace of such life, insignificant as it may have been, is of special interest. The meeting of all officers serving in the Nova Serbiya Corps for the discussion of a church matter deserves mention in this context. Khorvat sought to prevail upon the Synod to have Nova Serbiya made into a separate diocese independent of the Bishop of Pereyaslav. He requested the ordination of Vasili Kontzarevich as Bishop of Nova Serbiya in 1758. The Synod did not grant Khorvat's request and confirmed Nova Serbiya's dependence on the see of Pereyaslav. Thereupon, Khorvat summoned a general meeting of all officers of the Nova Serbiya corps, and it was resolved that:

The staff and company officers of Khorvat's Hussar Nova Serbiya corps, . . . the Novomyrhorod garrison and the Pandur infantry regiment, assembled in the Novomyrhorod retrenchment, the main site of the Nova Serbiya corps, on February 28, 1760, having each received for his company sufficient ordinances and instructions issued by the commander of the Nova Serbiya corps, Lieutenant General Khorvat, on the basis of Her Imperial Majesty's high personal privileges and decrees, concerning the settlement in Nova Serbiya of free people and clergy summoned from abroad to this area beyond the Dnepr to perform service for and be forever subjects of Her Imperial Majesty, and concerning the erection of the Lord's Churches . . . [ask for permission] to establish a separate diocese with a Bishop of the same nationality [as his flock] appointed by virtue of the Imperial privilege, in order to encourage the arrival of immigrants, rule the clergy of the corps and supervise the churches and dogmas, inasmuch as the corps always had such Bishops of the same nationality in the previous places of its sojourn.

Whatever the purpose of the meeting and the contents of the resolution adopted, the fact of its having been summoned is of interest. Its importance is somewhat diminished by the realization that participation in the meeting was limited to officers; the resolution was signed by seventeen ensigns, fourteen lieutenants, ten captains, three majors, and one lieutenant colonel. It is noteworthy that the meeting considered itself to be that of "free people," entitled to assemble for the purpose of regulating its affairs on the basis of privileges and charters.<sup>314</sup>

<sup>314</sup> Arkh. Arseni, "Sofronii Dobrashevich . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 295-300.

The next task will be to discuss the functions of the regimental commanders, who occupied the next highest rank in the administrative hierarchy. Their jurisdiction over the regiments and population living on the regiments' territories was similar to that exercised by Khorvat over the whole of Nova Serbiya. Accordingly, they were responsible to the Main Chancery of the Nova Serbiya corps.<sup>315</sup> In addition to carrying out military affairs, they supervised the colonization of the region and the recruitment of people from abroad; they also sought out the lands to be allotted, and administered and enforced justice, etc.

Turning to the personnel of the command, it is evident that the Hussar regiment never actually left Khorvat's control; its commanders were only nominal, "they carried out all matters in accordance with the dispositions of Lieutenant General Khorvat."<sup>316</sup> Khorvat personally commanded the regiment three times: between 1752 and March 4, 1754, between November 1, 1754 and February 1, 1755, and between August 19, 1755 and January 1, 1756. The nominal commanders of the regiment were as follows: First Major Nicholas Chorba, from March 4, 1754 to June 28, 1754; Lieutenant Colonel Dmitri Perich from June 28, 1754 to November 1, 1754; First Major Yuzbash, from February 13, 1755 to May 23, 1755; Chorba again, from May 23, 1755 to August 19, 1755; Captain Theodore Chorba, between January 1, 1756 and July 12, 1757; Captain A. Konstantinov, between July 12, 1757 and July 2, 1758; Lieutenant Colonel Anton Khorvat, between July 2, 1758 and January 1, 1760; Lieutenant Colonel A. Konstantinov from January 1, 1760 to September 27, 1761; First Major Tsvetinovich from September 27, 1761 to January 2, 1763.<sup>317</sup>

It appears from this list that the regiment commanders changed thirteen times within a decade. There were three commanders (Khorvat twice) in 1755; these and some others stayed in command of the regiment for only two or three months. On the other

<sup>315</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10114, July 5, 1753; No. 10933, March 9, 1759.

<sup>316</sup> *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 52, No. 1149.

<sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*, file 52, No. 1149; file 50, No. 1101.

hand, Khorvat personally commanded the regiment for three and a half years. His son, Anton, was in command for one and a half years; this was a purely nominal command since Anton was a schoolboy at that time. Thus Khorvat's command of the regiment, either directly or through his son, lasted for five years.

The commanders of the Pandur regiment carried more weight than their counterparts in the Hussar regiment, a feature which was noted by the investigating commission. This regiment was commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Michael Khorvat, the brother of the "founder," from October 1, 1751 to July 4, 1754; by Second Major George Arkani and Captain Popovich from July 4, 1754 to August 9, 1754; by First Major Nicholas Chorba from August 9, 1754 to July 15, 1756; by Major G. Arkani again from August 9, 1756 to October 15, 1756; by First Major Tsvetinovich from October 15, 1756 to May 17, 1757; by Captain Radkevich alone between May 21, 1757 and July 7, 1757 and jointly with Captain Popovich, from July 1757 to October 1, 1757; by Second Major Levul alone from October 12, 1757 to July 20, 1758 and jointly with Lieutenant Olishevski, from July 1758 to November 1, 1758; by Captain Olishevski from November 1, 1758 to April 28, 1759; by Lieutenant Colonel Ivan Khorvat, son of Michael, the regiment's first commander, from November 1, 1759 to September 9, 1762; by Major Levul, from February 9, 1762 to November 13, 1762; by Colonel Tsvetinovich from November 13, 1762 up to the end of the regiment's existence.<sup>318</sup> The comparison between the two lists of commanders shows that quite often the same person appears as commander both of the Hussar and Pandur regiment, and Khorvat's close relatives play a prominent part. It is interesting to note that there was occasionally a joint command over the Pandur regiment, e. g., Arkani and Popovich; Levul and Olishevski.

The regiments were divided into companies, led by company commanders and administered by company administrations or chanceries. According to Pišćević, "in each settlement, the com-

<sup>318</sup> *Ibid.*, file 52, No. 1149; Popov, ed., "Izveštije..." *op. cit.*, p. 399.

pany commander was the head of the settlement and of the families belonging to the company entrusted to him."<sup>319</sup>

Unfortunately, the scanty evidence prohibits an adequate description of the role and functions of the company commanders and their chanceries. Some details may be filled in, however. The principal feature of the relationship between company commanders and their subordinates, one which fell within the province of civil law, was the existence of a personal compact between the two parties. Most of the lower ranks serving in the companies had been brought from abroad at the company commanders' expense; thus, the latter were the recruiting agents of the company settlements. This kind of relationship was established by the Senate, when it decreed that an officer's rank could be held only by people bringing emigrants from abroad at their own expense. This recruitment at personal expense was practiced both by regiment and company commanders, and having invested money in the recruitment procedure, the commanders hoped to regain their capital along with a nice profit. The affair of the commander of the Pandur regiment, Joseph Petrovich Olishevski, gives an interesting picture of contemporary mores. In a complaint against Khorvat's injustice, submitted in 1762, Olishevski presents his case in the following manner: Olishevski had recruited 135 people abroad at his own expense, but Khorvat assigned only twenty-three of them to Olishevski's own company at Vilahosh and distributed the rest among other companies. All this notwithstanding the fact that Olishevski had spent considerable money recruiting these people and also "had paid Lieutenant General Khorvat a not insignificant amount for that company." Olishevski's situation became even worse, when Khorvat passed his company, the Sixth, to one Karachun and transferred Olishevski to another, the Eighth. Olishevski's complaint got into Prince Meshcherski's hands, who ruled in his favor and ordered the Sixth Company to be returned to him and Karachun to be transferred to the Eighth. However, the latter refused to accept this decision and continued to travel among the companies, making propaganda and, occasionally, collecting money.

<sup>319</sup> A. Pishchevich, "Primechaniya no Novorossiiskii krai," *op. cit.*, p. 115.

The Olishevski affair is interesting not only on account of the picture it gives of the relations between the commanders and the rank and file in Nova Serbiya, where these commanders had recruited a "troop" of people, tied to them by a personal contract, but also because it throws some light on various aspects of the life of the military officials. It appears from the complaint that a "corn tithe" was collected in each company. In the Vilahosh company 400 sheaves of grain were levied. A part of this "tithe" went to the Pandurs, in Vilahosh this part amounted to ten *chetverti* (one *chetvert'* equals about two hectoliters), the rest, to the regiment chancery, for "sundry extra expenses and the covering of the regiment's indispensable needs." Moreover, it appears from the complaint that company management leased out the companies' meadows to neighbors who mowed hay and grazed their cattle there. The neighbors of the Vilahosh company were Cossacks and *pospolyti* of the settlement Troynyt's'ke. The company commander drew up a contract with the *sotnyk* who represented the settlement. Olishevski pointed out in his complaint that Karachun had drawn up the contract "thievishly," receiving twenty-three rubles for the grazing of cattle and entering only thirteen. Furthermore, Olishevski accused Karachun of so mercilessly oppressing the Cossacks and *pospolyti* who mowed the grass and tilled part of the land "for the regiment, with exactions in money and corn," that the latter ceased to work, "causing a considerable loss in the company's funds."<sup>320</sup> From another document, the complaint of the residents of Troynyt's'ke, it may be gathered that by 1760 the regiment chancery took over the right of drawing up contracts for the tilling of the land.<sup>321</sup> Thus, the economic status of the Nova Serbiya settlements may be seen with greater clarity. Agriculture was practiced by the settlers themselves only to a very limited extent, if at all. Olishevski's complaint goes on to say that Karachun seized all Pandur lands illegally and had them sown with seed stolen from the "tithe thrashing floor." It appears that farming out land on a "half and half" basis was the principal form of land exploita-

<sup>320</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 84, where the entire Olishevski affair is documented.

<sup>321</sup> Yastrebov, "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yelisavety" *op. cit.*, XV, 570, 571.

tion. Therefore, the abolition of leasing threatened to ruin the company's, as well as the regiment's, economy.

As opposed to Nova Serbiya, Slavyanoserbiya remained under the jurisdiction of the Military College. The government closely modeled its organization after that of Nova Serbiya. Colonel Bibikov of the Corps of Engineers, who was sent to Slavyanoserbiya by the Senate, was given the task of establishing settlements there "on the same basis as had been set down for Major General of the Artillery, Glebov, in the places beyond the Dnepr." Following the practice adopted for Nova Serbiya, a detailed "instruction" was to be drafted for Bibikov. In 1753, Bibikov was rewarded with the rank of a major general for the construction of the "Ukrainian Line" and the settling of the Serbs. All detailed information on his activity in Slavyanoserbiya and his relations with Šević and Preradović, established in Slavyanoserbiya, were stationed next to, but enjoyed complete independence from each other. It has been stated above that both colonels (later promoted to the rank of major general) made this mutual independence a condition of their cooperation with the government. They also argued that they were superior in rank to Khorvat in the Austrian service. Therefore, they refused to be put under his command and asked for independent status since, they claimed, people who did not want to serve under Khorvat would go over to them.<sup>322</sup> As a result, two regiments with mutually independent commanders were created in Slavyanoserbiya. Such a division of power could not help but effect the amount of weight and authority carried by each. Nothing similar to Khorvat's sole rule occurred, and the part played by Šević and Preradović always remained within the normal, legal boundaries.

## VI. THE FOREIGN POPULATION OF NOVA SERBIYA AND SLAVYANOSERBIYA

It appears from the proposal submitted by Khorvat to the government as well as from the charter granted to him on January 11, 1752 that the immigrants to Russia were to be of "Serbian,

<sup>322</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 78; VIII, 690.

Macedonian, Bulgarian and Moldavian nationality" and Orthodox faith.<sup>323</sup> At the outset, the question of an immigrant's nationality did not interest the Russian government particularly, but allegiance to the Orthodox Church was considered of the utmost importance.

In 1752 the Senate stated in more precise terms that no one except the nationals mentioned above and particularly no "escaped people" hiding in Poland, especially the Poles, should be admitted. Khorvat and Glebov were ordered to "watch closely" that "no one [enter] from any nation except those mentioned."<sup>324</sup>

It soon became evident that neither Khorvat, Šević, nor Predavović were able to fulfill their commitments and to man their regiments fully, so long as the recruitment was limited to the "aforementioned nations." Glebov's letters removed all illusions the government may have harbored on this point and provided an important corrective for Khorvat's reports.<sup>325</sup> On the other hand, petitions began to arrive from various nations which had not been included; they desired to take advantage of the privileges and settle in Nova Serbiya. The Senate was faced with various problems and doubts, some of which deserve to be mentioned here. Khorvat reported to the Senate in 1752 that a Moldavian noble, Monolaki Zamfirakovich, came to Nova Serbiya from Moldavia and declared his desire to enter the services of Russia together with one thousand nobles of the "Serbian, Bulgarian, Greek and Moldavian nations." Fearing a protest by the Porte, the Senate did not risk an immediate solution of this problem, but asked the Russian Minister Resident Obreskov, for advice.<sup>326</sup> The affair came under consideration once more in November of the same year. Zamfirakovich explained that the emigrants in-

<sup>323</sup> PSZ, No. 9924, January 11, 1752.

<sup>324</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 493-94. In his instructions to Captain Mykhalcha, Khorvat declared that it was permissible to accept into Nova Serbiya all those who were willing, with the exception of Poles, Ukrainians, and Old Believers. *Fond novoserbskogo korpusa*, file 6, No. 24.

<sup>325</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 506-508.

<sup>326</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 662, 691, 692.

tended to pass through Poland and stay there for some time. Thereupon the Senate permitted them to settle in Nova Serbiya, for now they could be considered as immigrants from Poland instead of from Moldavia and Walachia, both under Turkish rule.<sup>327</sup>

At it turned out, however, this affair contained complications. The planned exodus of the Moldavians alarmed the Porte. In 1753, the pasha of Bendery approached the Polish authority and demanded that the Moldavians heading for Nova Serbiya through Poland be stopped and returned to Bendery. Tatar posts were set up along the border to intercept the emigrants. Vasyl Movchan, who reported to the Russian government on the situation in Bendery, wrote to the Vice-Governor of Kiev, Kostyuryn, that "everybody has rebelled" in Moldavia and "they all are fleeing there [i. e., to Nova Serbiya]."<sup>328</sup> It must be added, however, that the practical value of this undertaking was slight, since only a few Moldavians and Vlaxhs settled in Nova Serbiya this time. Monolaki Zamfirakovich, the organizer of the movement, was granted the rank of a captain but deserted in 1754 to Moldavia, having first borrowed 1,000 rubles from Brigadier Glebov.<sup>329</sup> He was the first of many adventurers who were to offer their aid to the Russian government in recruiting settlers from abroad.

It must be stated that on the whole a sizable number of Moldavians and Vlaxhs moved to Nova Serbiya. Quite a few Moldavians settled along the Inhul, the Inhulets' and the Tyasmyn; a large number of Vlaxhs asked for permission to settle on the Slobids'kyi regiment territory in 1761, since they did not want

<sup>327</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 718-20; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 739; N. V. Kalachev, ed., "Ekstrakt iz protokola Pravitel'stvuyushchago Senata ot 18. IX. 1758 o pereselenii Serbov v Rossiyu" [Excerpt from the minutes of the Governing Senate of September 18, 1758 concerning the transfer of Serbians into Russia], *Russkii arkhiv*; 1869, pp. 737-40.

<sup>328</sup> Andriyevski, *Materialy...*, pp. 270-72.

<sup>329</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 336-37, 350, 394.



to serve in Khorvat's command.<sup>330</sup> A number of Vlaxhs established themselves in Sukhyi Tashlyk.<sup>331</sup>

The Bulgarian colonization was considerable. The center of Bulgarian settlements was Novomyrhorod, and the vicinity about lake Lunha was named "Bulgaria." This name was preserved for a long time and attested to the presence of Bulgarians in that region. In addition to Novomyrhorod, Bulgarians also lived in Novoarkhangel's'k and Synyushyn Brid. In most cases, they came from Turkey via Poland.

The Russian government did not particularly insist on the restrictions imposed upon Khorvat and admitted other people in addition to those named, provided their transfer did not acquire a mass character or become widely known.

The attempts to organize a transfer of the inhabitants of Dalmatia, under Venetian rule at the time, are also interesting. In this case, the initiative came from the Exarch of Slavonia, Genadius Vasich and Bishop Simeon Kontzarevich. The latter offered his help in organizing a transfer of the Orthodox to Nova Serbiya in 1759. The Senate accepted this proposal, but expressed misgivings that the Venetian Republic might be displeased over the exodus of such a considerable number of people. Therefore it advised that the emigrant group be broken up into small parties and called "free people." Moreover, the Russian government refused to pay for services connected with recruitment of people or to send its own agents to conduct such a recruitment. Simeon Kontzarevich and his son, Lieutenant Kontzarevich, brought a small group of people with them; they first settled in Nova Serbiya but, since they disliked Khorvat's administration, some moved to Slavyanoserbiya, while others served in the Macedonian Hussar regiment.<sup>333</sup>

330 "Materialy dlya istorii Khersonskoi yeparkhii" [Material for the History of the Kherson Diocese], *Khersonskiye yeparkhial'nye vedomosti*, 1878, No. 14, p. 408.

331 Skal'kovski gives an indefinite account of this in *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 147-48.

332 A. Skal'kovski, *Bolgarškiye kolonii v Bessarabii i Novorossii* [Bulgarian Colonies in Bessarabia and New Russia], Odessa 1848, p. 3; and see his *Opyt statisticheskogo opisaniya Novorossiiskogo kraya*, pt. I, p. 227-29.

333 *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 42-3, 48-9, 66, 105-107, 351-53, 355-58, 422.

A lengthy correspondence followed the offer by Bishop of Melet, Anatolius, who proposed to bring 1,500 Albanians with him. Nothing definite resulted from this proposal.<sup>334</sup>

Montenegrins attracted the special attention of the Russian government as prospective settlers, since relations between Russia, the Ukraine and Montenegro had been of long standing. Montenegrin monks continually came to these lands "for charity" and brought rich gifts home. Now that a colony for all Slav "co-religionists" had been established in the Southern Ukraine, a captain of Khorvat's regiment, Ivan Markov, was dispatched to Montenegro to invite its inhabitants to come to Nova Serbiya; however, his mission was a failure.<sup>335</sup>

The adventurous undertaking of "Bishop" Vasili Petrovich is connected with the recruitment of Montenegrins. Petrovich submitted to the Russian government an offer to organize the exodus of all the Montenegrins and to form a separate regiment of them. He asked to be assigned a sum of fifteen thousand rubles per year for this purpose, "so that good order could be kept." The Senate cautiously declined the first proposal, deferring the formation of a regiment until such time as a sufficient number of Montenegrins would arrive, but agreed to a yearly subsidy. A special commission was appointed to direct this affair, but it was soon found to be a hoax. The "Bishop" turned out to be no bishop at all, and instead of Montenegrins he intended to recruit the so-called "*betyary*," i. e., vagrants who had gathered in Karlowitz in quest of employment, and priests who were widowers. He ordered the latter to have their beards shaved and to arm themselves and then passed them off as officers. Piščević, who directly participated in the recruitment of these alleged Montenegrins, depicted the units entrusted to him in the darkest colors. They were, in his words, "real rubbish, all thieves, without a penny to their name, drunkards; one could not find

<sup>334</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 69, 142, 143, 169, 421, 463, 503; XI, 326-327.

<sup>335</sup> KTsADA, No. 5312, sheets 172-183.

such rabble anywhere; there were actual armed robbers from the forests" among them.<sup>336</sup>

At first, the Montenegrins were to be settled in the province of Orenburg but, since they protested against this plan, they were organized into a special regiment. Part of the group was settled in Nova Serbiya, but this, too, did not satisfy them. They were, finally, included in the Novomyrhorod garrison.<sup>337</sup>

A small number of Greeks moved to Nova Serbiya and formed a separate community on the outskirts of the St. Elizabeth fortress.<sup>338</sup> Turks, Jews, and Poles were to be found among arrivals; all comers were accepted provided they adopted the Orthodox faith.<sup>339</sup> Among the unrealized projects was one of Obreskov. He proposed to have people ransomed from Turkish captivity and settled in Nova Serbiya, instead of being returned to Serbiya, Walachia or Greece.<sup>340</sup>

We are less informed about the colonization of Slavyanoserbiya. The decree of 1754 authorized Šević and Preradović to bring in people of "Serbian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Volksian [?], Albanian, Dalmatian, Montenegrin, Herzegovinian, Bosnian, Croatian and Slovenian" nationality as well as emigrants from Srem, Hungary, the Banat, Transylvania, Walachia, Moldavia "and other nations of Orthodox faith and Greek rite."<sup>341</sup> These "nations," however, were not too eager to move to Slavyanoserbiya. This may have been due to the fact that the government trusted Šević and Preradović even less than it did Khorvat. Moreover, the transfer of people to Slavyanoserbiya was badly

<sup>336</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 573; Popov, ed., "Izvestiye..." *op. cit.*, pp. 247-49; cf. also, G. Aleksandrov, "Istoricheskiye svedeniya o snosheniyakh Rossii s Chernogoriyeyu" [Historical Data on Relations Between Russia and Montenegro], *Russkii arkhiv*, XIV, 1876, No. 2, 257-58, 260-68.

<sup>337</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 45, 73, 109, 147, 391, 508, 534, 537, 542, 552, 556, 570, 594-96, 604-607; Solov'yev, *op. cit.* V, 802-808, 1057-1076, 1130-1132; Popov, ed., "Izvestiye..." *op. cit.*, pp. 369-71, 397-98; *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 9, No. 83.

<sup>338</sup> Yastrebov, "Greki v Yelisavetgrade," *op. cit.*, VI, 1884, 673-77.

<sup>339</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 621-22.

<sup>340</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr...*, I, 38.

<sup>341</sup> *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, issue XVI, pp. 135-36.

organized. Settlers had to wait in Kiev for several years before lands were allotted to them.<sup>342</sup> Obviously, rumors of such treatment spread abroad and discouraged prospective colonists from moving to Slavynoserbiya.

As has been already pointed out, since the "founders" brought only a small number of people with them, their only hope that the regiments would ever be fully manned lay in the expectation of a spontaneous flow of new settlers. To bring this about, it was imperative to create a good reputation for the newly-established settlements and to use all means to prevent the spreading of rumors of an unfavourable nature. Arguments of this kind are often to be found in Khorvat's reports. For instance, he asked that the fact of Glebov's being commander in chief not be overly stressed, otherwise, Khorvat argued, his authority might be undermined and emigrants discouraged from moving to Nova Serbiya. He also petitioned for permission for settlers to hire Ukrainians, since, he hinted, the lack of labor might have an adverse influence on the foreigners.<sup>343</sup> Another example of how sensitive Khorvat's reaction was to all facts which might blemish the good reputation of Nova Serbiya is this: He asked the Governor General of Kiev to move a detachment of the Moldavian regiment from Novoarkhangel's'k to another place, since, he said, "they spread various false, harmful and unbecoming rumors on the allegedly unstable situation in Nova Serbiya." "This," he continued, "might have an adverse effect on the willingness of people of this nation to depart for Nova Serbiya."<sup>344</sup>

Rewards were established for bringing in settlers: a captain's rank for one hundred recruits, a lieutenant's for seventy-five, and an ensign's for fifty recruits.<sup>345</sup> The Senate's decree of 1753 expressly stated that only persons who would take it upon themselves to bring "a certain number of people" from abroad should be given officer's rank in Nova Serbiya's regiments. This system of rewards led to constant disputes and misunderstandings. Nego-

<sup>342</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr...*, I, 38.

<sup>343</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10148, November 9, 1753.

<sup>344</sup> KTsADA, *Fond Kiyevskoi gubernskoi kantselyarii*, No. 5271 (old listing).

<sup>345</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 192.

tiators inflated the figures in their reports, credited themselves with the arrival of people who had come on their own initiative, and so forth. Sergeant (*Vakhmistr*) Filipovich, for instance, protested against Šević's assertion that he was "brought in" by the latter and argued that he came at his own risk.<sup>346</sup> Lieutenant Kontsarevich, the Bishop's son, complained that Khorvat did not give him a captain's rank "out of malice," although he had recruited a hundred people. A subsequent investigation disclosed, however, that he and Lieutenant Stankevich together had recruited only eighty people. Khorvat obtained a lieutenant colonel's rank for his six-year-old son Ivan for the alleged recruitment of several hundred settlers; he "rewarded" his elder sons in a similar manner.<sup>347</sup>

In addition to being rewarded with officer's rank, persons who recruited soldiers at their own expense took over certain specific rights of the recruits. Again, Captain Olishevski's complaint against Captain Karachun, filed with the chancery of the Hamburg infantry regiment in 1762 is interesting in this context, since it shows that company commanders treated their companies as their own private property.<sup>348</sup> It also reveals the principles governing the recruitment of these "owned" companies. Relations of a peculiar nature, reminding one of the feudal system of dependencies, developed between the commanders and their men. The regiment was composed, as it were, of a series of separate bands, whose members were closely attached to the person of the leader. This type of relation led not only to competition between the officers over the number of people recruited by each of them, but also to a continuous struggle for men who were lured from one company to another. Both higher and lower ranks practiced this decoying. Pišćević reports that the quarrels and intrigues of Šević and Preradović in Kiev were "a pitiful sight. Each of them strove to increase the number of men at his command and to win the people of the other over."

<sup>346</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 191, 194.

<sup>347</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, p. 398.

<sup>348</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 84.

Thus, both of them sent out special agents to induce people to come over to one or the other and then filed complaints with the Senate. In his turn, Khorvat lured people from each of them.<sup>349</sup> Incessant complaints by the "founders" and quarrels between them obliged the Senate to issue a decree, recognizing the right of all foreigners not bound by specific contracts to a commander to choose their abode and service. This measure, however, brought little improvement and did not end either the complaints or the continuous change of allegiance of both the officers and the rank and file.<sup>350</sup>

The effective strength of the regiments always remained insignificant. It is difficult to derive a true estimate from official reports, which concealed the actual state of affairs in the interests of the leaders of the colonization. At the Senate meeting of 1755 it was stated that there were 1,600 men in the two regiments of Nova Serbiya and, if their families were included, 4,500 people of both sexes.<sup>351</sup>

In spite of all efforts, the regiments were not fully manned during the entire existence of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya. This was repeatedly pointed out to the government by various informants, but the final revelation of the deplorable state of the foreign colonization of the region came at the time of the inspection undertaken by Lieutenant Colonel Spichinski. This inspection disclosed that large sums assigned by the government for the recruitment of settlers had for the most part remained unspent. It appears from the following table,<sup>352</sup> compiled on the basis of the findings of the inspection, that soldiers were recruited both at the government's and at the commander's own expense. At the same time, the table shows how small the number of people serving in the individual companies was, a circumstance which caused up to two thirds of the monies assigned to the companies (150 rubles per Hussar company and theoretically 140 rubles per Pandur company) to remain unspent.

<sup>349</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *loc. cit.*, pp. 171, 178, 199-200.

<sup>350</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171; *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 30-5, 191-94; *PSZ*, No. 10104, May 29, 1753.

<sup>351</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 451.

<sup>352</sup> *Fond novoserbskogo korpusa*, file 59, No. 1416.

TABLE I

## MANNING OF REGIMENTS WITH FOREIGNERS IN 1763

## A. Khorvat's Hussar Regiment

Number of company	Number of people in company	Recruited		Sum issued to company commander	Sum spent 1 rbl., 50 k. per head	To be ret'd to mainte- nance fund
		At commander's expense	At government's expense			
I	54	18	23	150	34. 50	115. 50
II	54	10	34	"	51. 00	99. 00
III	109	30	79	"	118. 50	31. 50
IV	52	—	42	"	63. 00	87. 00
V	126	77	49	"	73. 50	76. 50
VI	63	6	57	"	85. 50	64. 50
VII	93	4	89	"	133. 50	16. 50
VIII	—	—	—	"	—	150. 00
IX	54	1	33	"	49. 50	100. 50
X	50	5	29	"	43. 50	106. 50
XI	52	—	32	"	48. 00	102. 00
XII	58	7	39	"	58. 50	91. 50
XIII	53	16	39	"	58. 50	91. 50
XIV	54	—	14	"	21. 00	129. 00
XV	46	25	19	"	28. 50	121. 50
XVI	49	—	39	"	58. 50	91. 50
XVII	39	—	29	"	43. 50	106. 50
XVIII	57	—	27	"	40. 50	109. 50
XIX	39	22	9	"	13. 50	136. 50
XX	21	—	11	"	16. 50	133. 50
TOTAL	1123	221	693	3000	1039. 50	1960. 50

## B. Novomyrhorod Garrison

Number of people in garrison	Recruited		Sum issued to garrison commander	Sum spent per head 1 rbl., 50 k.	To be ret'd to mainte- nance fund
	At commander's expense	At government's expense			
131	15	116	500	Unknown	Unknown

## C. Pandur Regiment

Number of company	Number of people in company	Recruited		Sum issued to company commander	Sum spent 1 rbl., 50 k. per head	To be ret'd to maintenance fund
		At commander's expense	At government's expense			
				Rubles	Rbl., K.	Rbl., K.
IV	61	61				
VI	112	59	53	140	79.50	Money rec'd
VII	103	50	53	140	79.50	
IX	10	7	3	103	4.50	
XI	23	17	6	100	9.00	
XII	28	13	15	100	22.50	
XIII	6	3	3	20	4.50	
XIV	26	14	12	80	18.00	
XV	27	22	5	29	9.50	
XVI	20	20	—	—	—	
XVII	7	7	—	—	—	
TOTAL	423	273	150	712	227.00	
SUM TOTAL (THREE UNITS)			959	4212	1266.50	

The following table shows how low the effective strength of the regiments was, amounting to only 25.7 per cent of their overall nominal strength.<sup>353</sup>

TABLE 2

## NOMINAL AND EFFECTIVE STRENGTHS OF THE REGIMENTS IN 1762

Unit	Officers and Men			Officers		
	Nominal	Effective	Percentage	Nominal	Effective	Percentage
Khorvat's Hussar Regiment	4461	1844	41.3	102	70	68.6
Novomyrhorod Garrison	913	345	37.7	21	15	74.4
Pandur Regiment	4482	412	9.1	98	32	32.6
Bulgarian Regiment	1170	233	19.9	40	13	32.5
Nova Serbiya Corps Chanceries	13	13	100.0	4	4	100.0
TOTAL	11039	2,847	25.8	265	134	50.6

<sup>353</sup> *Fond novoserbskogo korpusa*, file 47, No. 965.



In view of such an insignificant number of "foreigners," the commanders naturally did not hesitate to enroll local inhabitants, Ukrainians, into the regiments in contravention of all decrees. All these Ukrainians, coming both from beyond the border and from *Het'manshchyna*, settled in the entrenchments and were referred to by the general name of "Serbs." In practice, special names came to be used for these "foreigners" of local origin, such as "newly-inscribed" or "newly-conscripted Serbs." A. A. Andriyevs'ki gives a vivid example to illustrate this transformation of Ukrainians into Serbs. Shapochnyk, a settlement inhabitant who worked with a stonemason from Kiev, fled from his master, was inscribed among the "newly-conscripted Serbs," and, "having become a Serb," as the official document has it, robbed his former employer.<sup>354</sup> These "newly-inscribed Serbs" were the most rebellious element in Nova Serbiya, given to robbery and brawling. In general, as a contemporary puts it, "only people of desperate ways had themselves inscribed among the Serbs."<sup>355</sup>

Spichinski's inspection disclosed a large number of these "newly-conscripted Serbs." He was interested in knowing what kind of people Khorvat had manned his regiments with. The investigation showed that many of the soldiers belonged to the "prohibited nations." But Khorvat managed to find an excuse in each particular case: all his Turks had been baptized, there was no way of telling a Greek from a Macedonian, etc. Spichinski's attention was drawn to the fact that many of the "foreigners" did not know their "native" language. Unfortunately, he did not mention what language these people spoke. In 1761, when a detachment of a thousand men left the Nova Serbiya corps to take part in a campaign abroad, Spychinski questioned the wives of the departed soldiers on the nationality of their husbands. Forty-seven of those questioned answered that their husbands were "Little Russians." This method of gathering information aroused Khorvat's indignation. He accused Spichin-

<sup>354</sup> Andriyevski, "Serby v Kiyeve," *op. cit.*, p. 384.

<sup>355</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 509.

ski of visiting the soldiers' wives in their homes during their husbands' absence and questioning them, so that now "their husbands will refuse to live with them and will leave the service"; he admitted that the wives were Ukrainian, but argued that they might not know the nationality of their husbands.<sup>356</sup>

The findings of Spichinski's inspection are not the only source for the national composition of Khorvat's regiments. There are many instances in which Ukrainians were referred to as "Serbs." In 1760, the hetman's General Military Chancery requested individual colonels to report the number of "inhabitants" who had moved to Nova Serbiya and enrolled in the Pandur regiment. It appeared that 45 people fled from the Poltava regiment, 201 from the Myrhorod regiment (in 1758 alone) and 40 from the Lubny regiment (in 1760).<sup>357</sup> Khorvat was ordered to return the deserters and the Senate strictly prohibited him from admitting them in the future; Khorvat invariably answered that "not a single person appeared within the boundaries of Nova Serbiya from Kremenchuk or Little Russia."<sup>358</sup> Sometimes it was possible to keep track of these fugitives. Thus Colonel Horlenko of the Poltava regiment, having found out that deserters from his regiment had enrolled into the Pandur regiment in Kryliv, complained about it to the hetman. In the course of the investigation it was disclosed that the Poltavians had enlisted in the Pandur regiment "fraudulently," since they concealed their origin and were taken for Serbs by the authorities. Thus, the administration of Nova Serbiya managed to prove its innocence. It must be added that the impostors did not suffer either, since all of them "escaped from their guards," as the official report by Khorvat puts it.<sup>359</sup>

Cossacks and *pospolyti* from Het'manshchyna and Slobids'ka Ukraine were not the only people who fled to Nova Serbiya. Serfs from Russia took refuge there, and, when Khorvat's posi-

<sup>356</sup> *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 32, No. 623.

<sup>357</sup> KTsADA, *Fond general'noi voiskovoi kantselyarii*, [Depository of the General Military Chancery], Nos. 12065, 14638.

<sup>358</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 14639; *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 20, No. 322.

<sup>359</sup> KTsADA, *Fond gen. voisk. kantsel.*, No. 14638.

tion had become unstable, the investigating commission was assailed with complaints and demands for the return of these fugitives to their landlords. Among the illegal arrivals were soldiers from various regiments, although their admission to Nova Serbiya had been strictly prohibited by the Senate.<sup>360</sup>

Those serving in the regiments of Nova Serbiya and Slavyano-serbiya were divided into two main categories, the officers and the lower ranks. From the very outset the officers, who were the privileged group in each regiment, firmly demanded to be reckoned among the "well-born Russian nobility," confirmed in the ranks they had held in Austria and, generally speaking, to be considered equal with the Russian nobility.

The lower category of inhabitants consisted of several groups. First among these groups were the servicemen, Hussars and Pandurs; then came their "substitutes," (*zastupayushchiye*) i. e., reserves serving in local garrisons, who replaced the servicemen when the regiment was in the field. The third group was that of *familiyaty*\*, who tilled their own holdings as well as those of the servicemen and "substitutes," when any of these were absent, but did not perform garrison or field service.<sup>361</sup>

The amount of land allotted to each of the foreign regiments has already been discussed. The question of the distribution of land among the regiment officials must now be touched. In each company or entrenchment, a part of the land was set aside as grants for officers of the "the ranks." The instructions to Glebov stipulated that the allotment of lands to Serbian officers was to follow the example of "territorial militia" regiments, i. e., a captain's allotment was to be a hundred *chetverti*; a lieutenant's,

<sup>360</sup> *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 36, Nos. 726 and 754.

<sup>361</sup> A. Klaus, *Nashi kolonii. Opyty i materialy po istorii i statistike inostrannoï kolonizatsii v Rossii* [Our colonies. Essays and Material on the History and Statistics of Foreign Settlement in Russia], fasc. I, St. Petersburg 1869, p. 6; A. A. Velitsyn, "Inostrannaya kolonizatsiya v Rossii" [Foreign Settlement in Russia] *Russkii vestnik*, February 1889, p. 5. A. Shch/ekatorv/, *Slovar' geograficheskii Rossiiskogo gosudarstva* [Geographical Dictionary of the Russian Empire], Moscow 1804, pt. II, p. 872; M. Slabchenko, "Familiyaty i zastupayuchi" [Familiyaty and substitutes], *Uchenye zapiski vysshey shkoly goroda Odessa* [Learned Notes of the Higher School of the City of Odessa], II, 1922, 81-4.

eighty; a second lieutenant's, seventy; an ensign's, fifty; and a common soldier's, twenty-six to thirty *chetverti* per family; priests and others connected with the church were to be assigned "the same" amount of land, or somewhat more.<sup>362</sup> Should the allotted area prove too small, or the soil of bad quality, Khorvat was empowered to change or increase the grants.

Initially, the government strictly enforced the exclusive rights of foreigners to live in Nova Serbiya. Therefore Russians performing service in the regiments—quartermasters, auditors, regimental clerks—were granted the same amount of land as "the ranks" but only for the duration of their service "and not forever."<sup>363</sup>

Although the decrees did not specify the legal status of these lands, it may be inferred from the Senate's decree of 1761 concerning the organization of the Slobids'kyi regiment. There, it was said that "each settlement of a *sotnya* shall be fully subdivided according to rank, as it was done in Nova Serbiya. . . and it shall be decreed concerning these lands that neither Cossacks nor officers dare sell or pledge it to each other; except for the buildings erected by them. The *sotnya* organization shall follow the pattern of the companies settled in Nova Serbiya in every respect."<sup>364</sup> This decree clearly shows that the use of the ranks' grants in Nova Serbiya was conditional, to the exclusion of the right of sale and mortgage, and that the buildings were the only unconditional property of the settlers.

The decree on the distribution of the officers' grants was not enforced for a long time. The question of surveying lands for the officers' grants in Khorvat's Hussar and the Pandur infantry regiments was brought up in 1761. On April 13 of the same year the Main Chancery of the Nova Serbiya corps instructed the regimental chanceries to see to it that officers used only those lands and appendages which had been allotted to them and "did not interfere with other lands."<sup>365</sup>

362 PSZ, No. 9935, February 3, 1750; A. Klauss, *op. cit.*, I, 6, see note.

363 PSZ, No. 10006, July 2, 1752.

364 *Ibid.*, No. 11312, July 14, 1761.

365 *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 174, Nos. 264, 266.

In Nova Serbiya, various staff and company officers turned into landlords, striving by all possible means to transform the grants assigned to them into hereditary possessions. The peopling of allotted lands with colonists was the principal method adopted in pursuit of this goal.

In managing their grants the officers encountered great difficulties; insufficient labor was one of them, and they made every effort to secure manpower. The rule of these newcomers to the region started with a ruthless exploitation of the local Ukrainian population. The stay of the Serbs in Kiev's suburb, Podil, was marked by incredible riots, robberies, and oppression of the peaceful inhabitants of this quarter of the city.<sup>366</sup> The Serbs made their journey from Kiev to their destination "in residents' wagons," which were provided for them by the population of regiments through whose territory they passed. A stream of complaints by the local administration and inhabitants followed them all along the route.<sup>367</sup> These intruders well-remembered the ideas expressed in the government's decrees, which stipulated that the local population should serve the newcomers' interests and advantages, and they tried in every way to exact those "advantages."

In 1752, Hetman Rozumovs'kyi complained to Empress Elizabeth of the "harm" inflicted upon the Ukrainian population "by Serbs and other newly settled... nations," but this complaint had little effect. A new report by the Hetman reached the diers of the Nova Serbiya corps who were using Cossacks dispatched to Nova Serbiya from different regiments for "personal" Senate in 1760. It contained protests against the officers and sol-services, e. g., ploughing, harvesting, cleaning stables, chopping wood, heating stoves, tending sheep, etc. The Senate ordered that a decree forbidding the use of Cossacks for any kind of service be sent to Khorvat and to Murav'yov, the commander of the fortress, but it is doubtful whether this decree was ever obeyed.<sup>368</sup> Complaints by the local inhabitants, forced to work for

<sup>366</sup> Andriyevski, "Serby v Kiyev", *op. cit.*, XII, 506-11.

<sup>367</sup> Bibl. Ukr. Akad. Nauk, *Zbirka O. M. Lazarevs'koho*, Nos. 63, 102.

<sup>368</sup> PSZ, No. 11047, April 4, 1760.

Serbian officers and soldiers, arrived in large numbers, but usually had no effect.

Within a short time, great estates existed on Nova Serbiya's territory. Naturally enough, Khorvat's estate (*ekonomiya*) occupied the first place among them. Asking for an increase of his land allotment, he proudly stated that "God willing, his household is prospering somewhat more than the others' farms" and that "he hopes to develop it in the future."<sup>369</sup>

Piščević's work refers many times to Khorvat's riches. He describes, but not in sufficient detail, his rich estate, with its beautiful house, its orchard and its large stable holding fifty horses. He also points out that Khorvat brought his herd of horses from the Austrian Empire, that almost all the trade of Novomyrhorod was financed by Khorvat's capital, and that the Greek merchants who traded in Novomyrhorod's shops were nothing but Khorvat's agents. It is known from Khorvat's report of 1762 that the wares displayed in Novomyrhorod at that time were better than those offered at the St. Elizabeth fortress, since in Novomyrhorod one could buy brocade, velvet and other expensive fabrics.<sup>370</sup> Other sources yield some further information on Khorvat's estate. Thus, in 1756, Khorvat asked the Governor of Smila, Dobryanski, "to be a good neighbor" and not to take offense if his herd of horses, with mares of 100 rubles each, should cross the border and be found in the steppe belonging to the province of Smila.<sup>371</sup> Also, all went well with Khorvat's cattle. In 1756, he asked Dobryanski to find him a buyer for his steers, to be delivered in Silesia. One herd had up to 180, another, up to 50 head, i. e., he possessed 230 head of cattle, partly of Ukrainian and partly of Moldavian breed. Khorvat added that he was well acquainted with the prices in Silesia, having once driven cattle into that country. Thus, he knew that the price of his herd would be 14-15 *chervontsy*, and of his second, 13-14 *chervontsy* per head. Khorvat's mills are sometimes mentioned in the docu-

<sup>369</sup> PSZ, No. 10029, September 21, 1752.

<sup>370</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye o pokhozhenii...", *op. cit.*, p. 401.

<sup>371</sup> *Zbirka N. D. Polons'koi-Vasylenko*, No. 54.

ments. Thus, First Major Tsvetinovich asked Governor Dobryanski's permission to carry lumber from the Lebedyn forest to build a mill for Khorvat.<sup>372</sup>

There is evidence of large scale stockbreeding by the officers of the Nova Serbiya corps. Captain G. Bulatsel' complained to Dobryanski in 1762 that his servant Lezhen', having lost many horses of the herd entrusted to him, had fled to Smila to escape responsibility. Curiously enough, Bulatsel' also complained that the herd abandoned by Lezhen' in the steppe could not be found for three days. In 1760, Lieutenant Colonel A. Konstantinov sold steers to the inhabitants of Lebedyn. Although the amount of the sale is unknown, it must have been considerable, since the buyers left a sum of 350 rubles unpaid.<sup>373</sup> The distilling of brandy held a prominent place among various branches of the officers' economic activity.

However, not all of the foreigners settling in Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya were able to establish large estates. The life of the newcomers was especially difficult in Slavyanoserbiya. S. S. Pišćević draws a vivid and convincing picture of the initial hardships facing the Serbs in a sparsely populated region where the people resented the foreigners' seizure of their lands. Especially difficult was the lot of Preradović's Serbs, who settled along the Luhan' and the Donets' rivers. In the region of Bakhmut, where government villages and older settlements were more numerous, it was easier to procure building materials and provisions than along the Luhan'. Lacking building materials, the Serbs made dugouts in the earth or built huts (*kureni*) from willows, which they covered with clay and roofed with grass. Since there were only a few experienced craftsmen among the Serbs and tools were lacking, the huts built by them leaked or were blown down by the wind. The house built of linden, which Pišćević bought for 46 rubles in the settlement of Novi Aydary, was considered a great luxury, yet, it had no glass windows and a reed roof.

<sup>372</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>373</sup> *Ibid.*

Generally speaking, it was difficult for the Serbs to buy anything, since according to the same author, the local population refused to deal with them, and the nearest settlements inhabited by freeholders lay at a distance of several days' ride on horseback. Those Serbs who had settled in the spring did not sow corn or plant vegetables and were thus reduced to near starvation for a whole year; they had to content themselves with rations received from government storehouses. Since there were no market places, all had to be purchased in the settlements of the freeholders on the other bank of the Donets, where meat, fowl, vegetables and flour was reluctantly sold and at exorbitant prices. Most provisions, therefore, were bought in Bakhmut. Later, the colonists discovered the route to Taganrog, Cherkask, and Azov and provisions and wines were brought from there. Hunting was of great help in procuring provisions, since game—wild goats, gorcecks, wild geese, partridges, and wild ducks—was abundant in these regions. The game was salted, smoked or pickled, and the furs of foxes, wolves, and other animals were sold at a good profit. These natural resources made Piščević prefer Slavyanoserbiya to Nova Serbiya.<sup>374</sup>

This difficult situation did not last long. Soon the Serbs became acclimated to the new conditions and large estates similar to those of Nova Serbiya began to spring up in Slavyanoserbiya, based mainly on the exploitation of the local Ukrainian population. It must be pointed out that much less is known of the conditions prevailing in Slavyanoserbiya than in Nova Serbiya. Therefore every feature of life in Slavyanoserbiya acquires a special interest. It appears from the available evidence that life was no better there than in Nova Serbiya. In 1761, the salt bureau of Bakhmut received a report by the salters Lozovyi, Boldyrev, Serbynov, Koshyyan, Kovbasa, Kryvodidenko, Levchenko and the apprentice Holubenko. These salters wrote that they had been in possession of homesteads along the Luhan' for a long time. Since the colonization by Slavyanoserbilan regiments, their report continued, Captain Savel'yev provided them with

<sup>374</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye o pokhozhenii..", *op. cit.*, pp. 185, 193, 196.



certificates which authorized them to collect dry wood and kindling in the Chernushyni ravines, transport it to Bakhmut, and sell it there. In exchange, each of them had to mow grass for five days, harvest ten sheaves, and do three days' ploughing for Captain Savel'yev. In 1761, however, the sergeant of Preradović's regiment, Endi Turgenyev, ordered them to provide him with thirty-nine carts of wood over and above their previous obligations. What was more, he took away the oxen, which they had used to haul the wood.<sup>375</sup>

Cossacks of the Slobids'ka Ukraine were dispatched to Slavyanoserbiya for the protection of the new settlements. The Serbs accepted them as a free labor force; they distributed them throughout their farms, took horses from them, forced them to tend their gardens, carry their wood, build dikes, etc. If the Cossacks refused to work, they were punished or beaten. Those who came to relieve them, were in turn distributed among the farms. Finally, the Cossacks would escape, some of them into the Don region, others, home, but then the authorities would dispatch new contingents to Slavyanoserbiya.<sup>376</sup>

## VII. THE UKRAINIAN POPULATION OF NOVA SERBIYA AND SLAVYANOSERBIYA

The new colonies of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya were established on a territory already sparsely populated by emigrants from the Left- and Right-Bank Ukraine, who had founded settlements, homesteads, and little towns. Among the difficulties of the continuous struggle, now against the Polish landlords on the Right-Bank, now against the Tatar invaders on the Left-Bank, these people, mostly wretched emigrants who had

<sup>375</sup> Institut Istoriyi Ukrain'skoi Akademii Nauk [Historical Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences], *Kopiyi spravy Arkhiv Bakhmutskoi zavodskoi kantselyarii* [Copies of Documents-archives of the office of the Bakhmut breeding farm]; bk. 9, No. 5, sheets 1-2.

<sup>376</sup> P. Golovinskii, *Slobodskiyе kozach'i polki* [Slobodskiyе Cossack Regiments], St. Petersburg, 1864, p. 187.

left the yoke of the landlords, foreign or indigenous, were engaged in the building of a new life. They ploughed the virgin soil, tilled the ground, sowed grain, raised cattle, and established apiaries. The passage from Zaporozhian rule to that of the Myrhorod or the Poltava regiments had little effect on their lives, since either one of these ruling bodies was contented with their fulfilling their obligations and paying taxes. Both taxes and obligations were less heavy here than in the *Het'manshchyna* or in the "Polish" Right-Bank Ukraine. Therefore, there was an incessant flow of settlers, who peopled homesteads, villages and settlements. Various decrees of the government strengthened their hopes of undisturbed possession of the lands they occupied.

However, with the creation of Nova Serbiya and Slavyano-serbiya, the status of the Ukrainian population underwent a radical change. The very first decrees regulating the life of the foreign colonies in the Southern Ukraine treated all local inhabitants as vagrants who had come there illegally. "Population not covered by a decree" was the official term used with reference to the local, indigenous inhabitants during the whole period of Nova Serbiya's existence. The fate of this population was clearly and precisely defined by the decree of December 29, 1751. The whole territory of Nova Serbiya was destined for colonization by foreign emigrants and no outsiders were to be allowed to settle there. "If there are some colonists in this area at present who have settled there without [the authorization of] a decree, they shall be returned to the places of their previous residence. They shall be instructed to sell their buildings at a price amicably arrived at by both parties to the aforementioned [foreign] people who have migrated to Russia."<sup>377</sup> In this first version, the decree meant ruin and perdition for the population. The return to the "places of their previous residence" meant, for the majority of the colonists, a return to regions from which they had fled to escape unbearable social and economic conditions, which had not improved during the colonists' absence. If they were to leave the places in which they had settled, they would have to forsake

<sup>377</sup> PSZ, No. 9921, December 29, 1751; *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 410.

the homes they had founded. And to what place could these people return? What could they expect there? At the same time, the order to sell their households, which were acquired by hard work, at a "price amicably arrived at," was tantamount to utter ruin. There remained only one solution: to flee abroad once more.

This decision was somewhat tempered in the instructions issued to the commander in chief of Nova Serbiya on February 3, 1752. The "population not covered by a decree" was permitted to remain temporarily in the settlements, "since it can be used here to the better advantage of the Serbs, who will be provided with quarters, agricultural tools, seeds and other things, in the period of settling down and building their own homes."<sup>378</sup> In this manner, the instructions outlined the role of the "population not covered by a decree" with respect to the foreign colonists. Such, also, was to be the attitude of the Russian government in the future.

It must be added that the local population only learned of these decrees *post factum*; the Serbs fell upon the inhabitants as the Tatars and other enemies had done before. The population not only received no advance notice, but the commanders of the detachments stationed beyond the Dnepr were also caught unawares. For instance, the commander of a unit stationed in Tsybuliv, Lieutenant Colonel von Finiks, sent an urgent query to his superior, the Governor General of Kiev, as to the attitude he should take towards Khorvat who had appeared unexpectedly and demanded that Tsybuliv be handed over to him. Should he comply with this demand or offer resistance?<sup>379</sup> The hetman himself was notified of the transfer of the Myrhorod regiment lands, which were under his control, to Nova Serbiya as late as the beginning of 1752, and considerable delay occurred before he could pass the news on to the population. As it happened, the population was informed about the change in its status mainly through Khorvat and his officials. There is no doubt that this

<sup>378</sup> PSZ, No. 9935, February 3, 1752.

<sup>379</sup> KTsADA, *Fond kiyevskoi gubernskoi kantseľ.*, No. 5269.

news was not enthusiastically received by the "population not covered by a decree," and that it did not contribute to the establishment of neighborly relations with the new rulers of the region. Khorvat complained to the Senate that he was "not particularly benevolently received" by the population, which until then had not even been given "public notice and decree to the effect that these lands were already called Nova Serbiya."<sup>380</sup>

The sweeping decision to remove the local population because it was "not covered by a decree" proved a failure; it introduced many complications and required many correctives. One of them, the permission to remain temporarily "for the Serbians' advantage," has already been mentioned. Opposition to such a solution of this complicated problem stemmed from various quarters. In the first place, the hetman lodged a protest. In his report, he called the attention of the government to the fact that the population of the area had moved here in accordance with the Senate's decrees, i. e., in a completely legal manner. Furthermore, the hetman's report went on, many Cossacks serving in the regiments lived on this territory and many Cossack officers possessed estates there, which had been confirmed by charters and proclamations. Therefore, the hetman asked that these estates and their appendages not be apportioned to the Serbs, who should rather be settled on those lands beyond the Dnepr subject to the Sich. He added, however, that "the Zaporozhian Host submits that these places belong to them on the basis of previous rights and privileges (*vol'nosti*) and charters, so that [such a measure] would be oppressive for them." In its detailed reply to the hetman, the Senate insisted upon the apportionment of this territory to Nova Serbiya and justified its decision by saying that "these lands situated within the boundaries of Her Imperial Majesty were completely deserted and in no one's possession." The Senate contradicted itself on this point, since it went on to point out that according to information received, there were 195 households of emigrants from Poland and 3,170 households of

<sup>380</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 592-93; *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, Issue XVII, 11-12.

emigrants from "Little Russia," the Slobids'ki regiments, and Zaporizhzhya in the disputed area. True enough, the Senate conceded, the decree of 1741 authorized the establishment of settlements in that area, but the decree of 1744 forbade their settling near the Polish frontier. Therefore, the argument continued, it was not fitting to defend the interests of these settlers. The representatives of the Ukrainian nobility, too, had no rights to these territories, since they had failed to have these rights confirmed after the incorporation of the area into the Russian Empire. The Senate enjoined the College of Foreign Affairs "to order the Hetman to promulgate a disposition enforcing the execution of the foregoing in all of Little Russia." The College was also to use all means at its disposal to "keep the population from fleeing abroad."<sup>381</sup>

This was not the final decision. After having reconsidered the problem of the "population not covered by a decree," the Senate decreed on November 20, 1759 that the inhabitants should be divided into two categories: the "old settlers" who had lived there for a long time and the emigrants from Poland (the latter numbering 195 families), and those from "Little Russia." The first group, 643 households according to the most recent census, was for the time being to remain unmolested; their case was to be examined separately and a decision as to whether they should remain or be settled elsewhere, made at a later date. Those who had come from "Little Russia" (3,170 households) were to return to the places of their previous residence, once the number of foreigners had increased. They would be given half a year's time to prepare themselves for the departure.

It must be added that the Senate considered not only those settlers who had come directly from the Left-Bank Ukraine, but also those who had first fled to Poland and arrived in the "places beyond the Dnepr" from there, as subject to deportation. They were expressly asked "not to flee to Poland again, but to proceed to Little Russia, to the places of their former residence, from which they had fled to Poland."

<sup>381</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 661-669; *Bibl. Akad. Nauk, Zbirka O. M. Lazarev'skoho*, bk. 63, pp. 723-27.

In actuality this decision of the Senate was extremely difficult to enforce. Not only did the population which had emigrated from "Little Russia" show no desire to return, but it hastily began to cross the Polish frontier. The imperial decree to Hetman Rozumovs'kyi contains a curious detail. "We hear from Khorvat," Empress Elizabeth wrote, "that almost all of the inhabitants not 'covered by a decree' have already sold their settlements. . . but, as may be gathered from their actions, they have no desire to go to Little Russia. Although they might be forced to do so if the measure were enforced with vigilance, it would be impossible to prevent their return to Polish territory, since these places lie near the Polish frontier."<sup>382</sup>

The *sotnyk* of Tsybuliv, Baydak, informed his superiors on the basis of reports received from the village chiefs that "some of the inhabitants of these villages who had come from Polish territory have begun to flee secretly, in fact, a number have already fled." The *sotnyk* ordered the village chiefs to intercept the fugitives and keep an eye on the inhabitants. The Myrhorod regimental chancery, too, enjoined Colonel Yermin not to let the inhabitants of the area under his command cross the border. The Provincial Chancery of Kiev ordered the commander of the outpost, Nikiforov, to see to it that the inhabitants "not covered by a decree" do not escape abroad.<sup>383</sup>

These orders indicate that the flight of settlers "not covered by a decree" was acquiring a mass character and causing alarm in the local administration. Another interesting report of the *sotnyk* of Tsybuliv, Baydak, to the commandant of the St. Elizabeth fortress dates from 1753. In reply to the question of why the price of hay had gone up, Baydak wrote that "only a very small number of inhabitants" and only "the most prosperous among them" had mowed hay after the decree of 1752, since many of them had gone to "Little Russia." In other words, only the rich ones, who found it difficult to liquidate their possessions, remained.<sup>384</sup>

<sup>382</sup> *Zbirka*, O. M. Lazarevs'koho, bk. 63, p. 112.

<sup>383</sup> KTsADA, *Fond kiyevskoi gub. kantsel.*, No. 1888.

<sup>384</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysavety*, No. 1.

People fled not only to Poland but also to Zaporizhzhya. The data collected by Bishop Feodosii contain many important references to the dates from the founding of certain settlements. Boyans'ka, for instance, was peopled in 1752 by the inhabitants of Plakhtiivka and Butivka, who had to leave these villages in execution of the order concerning the "population not covered by a decree."<sup>385</sup> According to A. Skal'kovski's data, emigrants from Poland now left Nova Serbiya and settled in several places (*urochyshche*) in Zaporizhzhya. Romankova Mohyla, Kamyans'ke on the Dnepr and others were thus settled before 1758.<sup>386</sup>

In general, a large segment of the population of the Kryliv and Tsybuliv *sotni* left their permanently established places and moved south. People not only fled from Nova Serbiya, but also from the twenty verst belt along the Polish frontier, which was occupied by Ukrainians. Desertions from this belt were reported by the hetman in his letter to the Empress. He also complained in the letter that the Serbs' cattle were trampling down the fields of the inhabitants of the town Kryliv and the village of Taboryshche, both situated beyond the territory apportioned for the Serbs. Moreover the Serbs made the inhabitants "perform personal services" for them and "had many of the local inhabitants enrolled into service." The hetman asked for permission for these people to move to the "Ukrainian Line," but the Senate did not grant this request, limiting itself to enjoining Glebov and Khorvat "to watch closely" that these inhabitants were not harmed, or required to perform personal services, or enrolled into (government) service, or prevented from grazing their cattle.

The flight of the population finally alarmed the authorities in St. Petersburg. The question of the fate of the "population not covered by a decree" who were temporarily left in the places where it had settled, was raised by Count P. I. Shuvalov at the Senate session of mid-March 1753. Shuvalov pointed out that

<sup>385</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy dya istoriko-statisticheskogo opisanija Yekaterinoslavskoi I*, 273.

<sup>386</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 179.

by the terms of the Imperial decree, it had been decided to establish the Serbian newcomers among Russian subjects, but no decision had as yet been forthcoming on these native Russian subjects. Therefore, acting upon Shuvalov's proposal, the Senate decided to station "territorial militia" regiments in the zone allotted to the five Serbian companies which had not yet been formed, to settle "old settlers and emigrants from Poland living in the places beyond the Dnepr" among these regiments, and "to make these people into Cossacks, on the model of the Slobids'ki regiments, so they would not be subjected to landlords."<sup>387</sup> Thus was the nucleus laid for the Slobids'kyi Cossack regiment, which occupied a twenty kilometer belt extending from the Dnepr and the Southern Bug to Nova Serbiya's southern border.

On August 18, 1753, the Senate heard the report of the Commander in Chief of Nova Serbiya, Glebov, and Khorvat, whose opinions on the settlement of "old settlers" on the model of Slobids'ki regiments it had sought. Both welcomed the measure and pointed out that the "population not covered by a decree" was increasing in Arkhangel's'k, Petroostriiv, and other localities; furthermore, escapes abroad were so widespread that "it was impossible to keep track of or prevent" them.<sup>388</sup> At the same time, geodesists, Lupandin and Gur'yev, were sent to draw a map of the territory destined for the settlement. Since the details on the organization of the Slobids'ki regiments were unknown to the Senate, Colonel Kapnist, the commander of these regiments, was asked to provide information on the strength of, and the amount of land allotted to, each of them. On November 2 of the same year the Senate decreed that "it is necessary to appoint a Great Russian officer to better inspect and patrol the newly-established Little Russian inhabitants, who are settling as Cossacks, and the emigrants from Poland." The post was given to Captain Nikita Bykov who had been attached to the provisions store of the Arkhangel's'k retrenchment. Among his duties were: to report on all people living in these localities and

<sup>387</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 40-1, 64-5.

<sup>388</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 125-26.



on those arriving from Poland; "to carefully inspect and supervise, the regular construction and [see] that all things necessary for the colonization be provided"; to settle disputes, and recruit and receive emigrants from Poland.<sup>389</sup>

For a long time no exact information on the creation and the beginning of the Slobids'kyi regiment was to be found in historical literature. Skal'kovski, for instance, asserts that the establishment of the regiment was due to the initiative of Commander M. A. Murav'yov; however, the regiment was founded in 1753, and Murav'yov was not appointed until 1758.<sup>390</sup> In another work, Skal'kovski connects the creation of the regiment with the activity of Colonel Lupul-Zverev and maintains that it was formed from Moldavians.<sup>391</sup> A. Shmidt writes that the establishment of the regiment followed upon the initiative of M. A. Murav'yov and that it was formed from Old Believers and joined by "a Slobids'kyi regiment brought from the Ukraine to be settled [in that area]."<sup>392</sup>

Generally speaking, no foresight or planning was involved in the organization of the Slobids'kyi settlement. The government groped its way even more than when it organized the foreign colonies; it never took the initiative. The hasty decrees caused a mass flight of the Ukrainian population, which did not want to return to the "places of its previous residence." Some way had to be found to keep this population from further flight and to use it for the protection of the frontiers. The organization of a regiment of settlers was the best formula, since it satisfied the need for military protection and furthered the economic interests of the region.

Nothing is known of the initial organization of the regiment. In 1754, the Commander in Chief of Nova Serbiya, Glebov, asked the Senate what principles were to govern the life of the regiment: What area was to be allotted to it? Where were the of-

389 *Ibid.*, pp. 125-26, 201-202.

390 Skal'kovski, *Khronologi. obozr.*, I, 28.

391 Skal'kovski, *Opyt statisticheskogo opisaniya Novorossiiskogo kraya* I, 253.

392 Shmidt, *Materialy dlya statist. i geograf. opisaniya Rossii*, I, 34.

ficers of the regiment and the *sotni* to come from? "To whom might such a regiment and the other Little Russian inhabitants be responsible?" since "disturbances" might occur, were this regiment put under jurisdiction of the Little Russian Administration (*Malorossiiskoye upravleniye*). The Senate decided that the regiment would be under the control of the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress. There were no grounds, the Senate maintained, for putting the regiment under the Little Russian Administration, since those of its inhabitants who had emigrated from "Little Russia" had to be returned to their former homes. As for the appointment of officers to the regiment and the *sotni*, the Senate requested Glebov's opinion on this subject.<sup>393</sup>

Such an indefinite order apparently lasted until 1757; Captain Bykov was in command of the regiment during this time. In 1757, regimental officers and the regiment's colonel, Nicholas Stefanovich Odobash (or Adabash) were appointed. Odobash was of Turkish origin, but had lived in the Ukraine for a long time. He served in the old Hungarian regiment from 1737 and later joined Khorvat's regiment. In 1753, he was Khorvat's aide-de-camp and one of his favorites. Khorvat obtained from him a first major's rank as a reward for having recruited colonists abroad. Later, Odobash headed Khorvat's field chancery "and dispatched various affairs, both secret and public."<sup>394</sup> However, finding Khorvat's arbitrariness unbearable, he went over to the camp of the foe, i. e., the Slobids'kyi regiment, where he found himself in the company of Khorvat's arch-enemy, Commander Murav'yov. In 1760, Khorvat accused Odobash and Murav'yov of abuses and treason, and they were dismissed from their posts.<sup>395</sup> Odobash was replaced by the Commissioner for Border Affairs, Colegiate Assessor Joachim K. Litvinov, who was appointed colonel of the regiment.<sup>396</sup> In the same year, two representatives of the regiment's officers' corps, Robota and Ustymovych, were

<sup>393</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 260-62.

<sup>394</sup> *Ibid.*, IX, 37.

<sup>395</sup> *Arkhiv novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 19, No. 293.

<sup>396</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XI, 2.

dispatched to St. Petersburg to request the Senate to put the regiment's affairs in order and reinstate Odobash.

Litvinov, however, retained his commission until his death in 1762. Thereupon, Glebov, the Governor General of Kiev, put forward the candidacy of the new Commissioner for Border Affairs, Ivan Chuhuyevets', but the Senate did not confirm him. Instead, yielding to the renewed requests of the regiment's officers, it reinstated Odobash after lengthy negotiations.<sup>397</sup> Odobash remained the regiment's colonel until the end of the period discussed in the present work.

An interesting drive among the regiment's officers to bring about a change of the regiment's commander in favor of Khorvat was connected with the events discussed above. Depositions of the accused have come to us among the materials bearing on the investigation of this affair by the garrison chancery, which opened after Murav'yov's reinstatement. The agitation was started by *sotnyky* Yakiv Dyk, Ivan Sirenko and others. They collected signatures of "those willing to be in the command of Lieutenant General Khorvat," and the signatures even included the name of a superior officer, *oboznyi* (quartermaster) Mykhal'cha. The latter explained his stand by the consideration that "although a considerable amount of money has been spent on the foundation and organization of the settlement here, it remains utterly deprived of all necessary things owing to the dismissal of local commanders."<sup>398</sup> *Sotnyk* Sirenko, who brought the list to Dyk, urged him to add his signature, since, he said, "the settlers here are helpless owing to the dismissal of Brigadier Murav'yov and Colonel Odobash." It is interesting that Sirenko should justify his attitude by a reference to the settlers' interests. The connection between this affair and the transfer of the regiment to Khorvat's command is not clear. The change brought a deterioration in the Cossacks' position, since, according to the testimony of *sotnyky* Derevyans'kyi and Dyk, Khorvat

<sup>397</sup> *Ibid.*, XII, 432.

<sup>398</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysavety*, No. 69.

immediately imposed new taxes of five and ten kopecks on each Cossack of the regiment for chancery maintenance.<sup>399</sup>

Once in command of the Slobids'kyi regiment, Khorvat displayed an uncommon amount of energy. He required Litvinov to provide him with information on the strength of the regiment, the number of Cossacks, officers, burgers, Old Believers, etc. He also ordered Litvinov to instruct Menzelius to draw a map of all the settlements with an indication of the number of households and the amount of land attached to them, so that "dispositions might be taken" to divide the regiment into "lots" on the model of Nova Serbiya. He enjoined Litvinov to defend the interests of the merchants living in the outskirts of the St. Elizabeth fortress and to protect the settlers from wrongdoings and exactions.<sup>400</sup> Khorvat instructed the Main Chancery of the Nova Serbiya corps to see that Litvinov carried out his orders and not to let the garrison chancery intervene in the regiment's affairs.<sup>401</sup> It is interesting to compare these orders of Khorvat with the evidence obtained from the *sotnyky* during the investigation of Khorvat's exactions. Even more revealing is a comparison with the petition submitted to the Senate by Robota and Ustymovych as representatives of the regiment's officer corps, in 1762. They asked for the liberation of the regiment from Khorvat's rule, since "people were being brought to utter ruin" and their "only salvation lay in flight." The Senate's decree of 1762, "concerning the regiment's return to the jurisdiction of the commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress," was the result of this petition.<sup>402</sup> This did not last for long, however. On October 18, 1763 the Commander in Chief of Nova Serbiya, Mel'gunov, referring to the decree of the Military College, informed Odobash, that his regiment and settlement were to be "under my strict orders. All questions concerning the regiment and the settle-

<sup>399</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>400</sup> Odes'kyi istorychnyi muzey *Rukop. Zbirka "Obshchestva istorii i drevnostei,"* II-31-65, p. 59.

<sup>401</sup> *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 46, No. 958.

<sup>402</sup> *Ibid.*, file 49, No. 1058.

ment should be referred directly to me and all decisions will come from me."<sup>403</sup>

During the first years of the regiment's existence the officer corps consisted of a colonel (held by Odobash, then by Litvinov, and then by Odobash again), an *oboznyi* (V. A. Mykhal'cha for the whole period), who replaced the colonel in the latter's absence, a regimental judge (Grigori Butovych for the whole period), a regimental ensign (Ivan Makohin) and a *pyсар*.<sup>404</sup> This last office was held by several persons, first by V. Semeniv, then by G. Butovych and, from 1761, by Nazar Chernyavs'kyi.<sup>405</sup> The regimental captains and sub-ensigns (*pidpraporni*) ranked lower.<sup>406</sup>

The staff of the regiment was definitively established in 1762. It comprised the colonel, the *oboznyi*, the judge, two regimental captains, a cavalry captain, two clerks, the standard bearer, a physician, the regimental provost (*horodnychyi*), the regimental chief, and the chancery consisting of three secretaries and three clerks. Fifty sub-ensigns were attached to the regiment, which consisted of twenty *sotni*, each with a *sotnyk*, a chief, two clerks, an ensign, and two captains. Each *sotnya* had to have fifty *vyborni* Cossacks (Cossack enlisted in regular military service), 450 *pidpomishnyky* (personnel who are not full Cossacks), two priests, one singer, four sacristans. There were five guns with the regiment, served by thirty men. The regimental chancery had its headquarters in the St. Elizabeth fortress. The chancery's decrees bore the signatures of the colonel (or the *oboznyi*), the judge and the secretary.<sup>407</sup>

The regimental officers were elected by the Cossacks. As has been seen, in the decree of 1762 the Senate declined to confirm Commissioner Chuhuyevets' as colonel, in spite of his having been recommended by the Governor General of Kiev, Glebov. To justify its refusal, the Senate stated that "since it [the Cos-

<sup>403</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 110.

<sup>404</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 22, 25, 31, 37, 63.

<sup>405</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 88, 11; KTsADA, *Fond kiyevskoi gub. kantsel*; No. 5111.

<sup>406</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 26.

<sup>407</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 11, 223.

sack regiment] has been created on the model of the Slobids'ki regiments, the selection of its colonel is to reflect the general desire and choice of the Cossacks themselves. No such desire has been expressed with reference to Chuhuyevets'."<sup>408</sup> When the representatives of the regiment petitioned for the reinstatement of Odobash in 1763, the Senate refused to follow suit once more; it advised them "to make an election and submit [the results] to the Senate; it is not possible to confirm Odobash otherwise."<sup>409</sup> It is difficult to evaluate the reasons proffered by the Senate, since it is not clear whether the confirmation of a colonel without his previous election was really considered impossible, or whether this was merely a pretext to avoid appointing an undesirable candidate. One should not forget that Litvinov was named without any elective procedure.

An interesting document, illustrating the manner in which the elections of officers of the Slobids'kyi regiment took place, has come down to us. The office of the regimental *pysar* became vacant in 1761. The officers of the regiment and *sotni* "proposed that the vacancy in the office of the regimental *pysar*, caused by the death of Vasili Semeniv, be filled by the senior clerk Nazar Chernyavs'kyi, who has seniority, and for whose good qualities and worthiness they vouched." They sent a corresponding report to Commander Murav'yov, who, in turn, submitted the matter to the Governor General of Kiev, Glebov, "for his high consideration and confirmation." In reply Glebov notified Murav'yov that Chernyavs'kyi "has been made a senior *pysar*" and that he should fulfill his duties conscientiously, "and expedite assiduously all written business with the knowledge of the regiment's officers."<sup>410</sup> The document, then, contains information on the election, or rather recommendation, of a candidate by the regiment's officers, the approval of this recommendation by the commander, and, finally, the appointment of the candidate by the Governor General. The obligation of the *pysar*, to dispatch busi-

<sup>408</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 194.

<sup>409</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.

<sup>410</sup> KTsADA, *Fond kiyevskoi gub. kantsel.*, No. 5112.

ness only with the knowledge of the regimental officers is a noteworthy feature of this appointment.

It is difficult to say to what extent this elective principle was the rule in the regiment. We have already seen that the first staff of the regiment was entirely appointive. That only Ukrainians could serve in the regiment was a basic rule, which, however, was continuously violated. Both Colonel Odobash, a man of Turkish origin, and *oboznyi* Mykhal'cha were foreigners, but it proved to be no obstacle to their serving in the regiment.

The regiment was divided into twenty *sotni*, each led by a *sotnyk* with his staff. The *sotnyky* were "full" or "junior," the latter replacing the former in case of absence. Sometimes, *ad interim sotnyky* were appointed from among those retired. *Sotnyky* were appointed and dismissed by the commander of the fortress or by the colonel; this was an easy procedure which, at times, required no reason.<sup>411</sup>

People of all sorts were made *sotnyky*, and it is difficult to ascertain which elements were predominant in their cadres. In the part of the regiment established on the former territory of the Poltava regiment with its numerous officers' estates, these positions were often held by the former aides-de-camp, for instance, in Omel'nyk by Khoma Lyakh, in Kalyuzhna by Vasyl' Robota, in Kamyanka by Vasyl' Hehela, etc.<sup>412</sup> The situation was similar in the allotted areas of the *sotni*, which were previously held by the Myrhorod regiment; thus in Verblyuzhka, Joseph Chechelya was the *sotnyk*; in Hruz'ka, Vasyl' Koshovenko; in Tashlyk, Fedir Voyna; in Tyshkivka, Zervanyts'kyi; etc.<sup>413</sup> Commanders of military units protecting Nova Serbiya were also appointed *sotnyky*. P. Dyk, aide-de-camp of the Myrhorod regiment stationed in Novomyrhorod with his detachment, was appointed *sotnyk* of Murzychka, and Semen Lebedyns'kyi, *sotnyk* of Domotkan'.<sup>414</sup> Sometimes persons who had

<sup>411</sup> *Arkhiiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, Nos. 20, 59, 97.

<sup>412</sup> *Bibl. Akad. Nauk, Zbirka O. M. Lazarevs'koho*, No. 63.

<sup>413</sup> *KTsADA, Fond kiyevskoi gub. kantsel.*, Nos. 12762 1906; *Bibl. Ukr. Akad. Nauk, Rukop. vid.*, Nos. 2035, 3815.

<sup>414</sup> *Arkhiiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 59.

served the government well were rewarded with this office. For example, Vasyl Movchan, a Polish nobleman and former secretary to the pasha of Bender who had provided the Russian government with vital information, was appointed the *sotnyk* of Pletenyi Tashlyk in 1753. For greater security, his name was changed to Molchanski and he was forbidden to carry on correspondence with foreign countries.<sup>415</sup> This was by no means an isolated case. Nicholas Donets' obtained the office, *sotnyk* of Tyshkivka, as reward for his intelligence work in Poland. In some cases no merit was involved, e. g. Murav'yov appointed Alternats'kyi, a musician of Colonel Gran, a *sotnyk*. The appointing of sons of *sotnyky* or other members of the regimental officers' families to this office was a rather common occurrence. Judge Butovych made his two sons *sotnyky*; the *sotnyk* of Murzychka, Paul Dyk, appointed his son Jacob, and *sotnyk* Sirenko, his stepson Ivan.<sup>416</sup> In some cases recruiting agents were appointed, but these were exceptions to the rule; usually they were promoted first to the chief's post and only then to the *sotnyky*'s. By way of such exception, the recruiting agent of Pletenyi Tashlyk, Semen Sych, was appointed *sotnyk* of Vys', but it is difficult to say whether or not this was an isolated case. Finally, we know of the appointment of a retired lieutenant, Nedilko-Voynov, as a *sotnyk*.<sup>417</sup> In addition to those commanding the *sotni*, there were two *sotnyky* attached to the St. Elizabeth fortress.

Prior to the formation of the regimental staff, the *sotnyky* were under the direct orders of the fortress commander. The decrees which they received from the commander's chancery opened with the formula: "Decree of Her Imperial Majesty, Autocrat of All the Russias, issued by the chancery of the Brigadier and Commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress to the future regimental officers and to the present *sotni* of the Slobids'kyi boundary of Nova Serbiya, as well as to whom it may concern."<sup>418</sup>

<sup>415</sup> Yastrebov, "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yelisavety," *op. cit.*, XV, 567.

<sup>416</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 63; Yastrebov, "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yelisavety," *op. cit.*, pp. 467-68.

<sup>417</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 107.

<sup>418</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 11.



The orders originating from the regimental chancery usually began as follows: "From the Chancery of the Slobids'kyi Regiment, from the St. Elizabeth fortress to Novoarkhangel's'k to the noble and honored *sotnyky* and officers" or "from the fortress even to the Dnepr."

With the establishment of the regimental chancery, the *sotnyky* came under its jurisdiction. In isolated instances, however, the fortress commanders issued direct orders to them, bypassing the regimental chancery. This occurred, for instance, in 1762, when Murav'yov sent an order to the *sotnyk* of Ovnyanka, Avramenko, enjoining him not to molest the *vyborni* Cossacks Grigori Kit and Philip Usychenko, not to give them assignments far away from the settlement, not let them be wronged, etc.<sup>419</sup>

When the regiment was transformed into the Yelisavetgrad Lancer regiment in 1764, almost all the *sotnyky*—except for those retired—were granted officers' ranks and included among the nobility of the New Russia Province.<sup>420</sup>

The chancery was the administrative organ of the *sotnya*. It was composed of the *sotnyk*, the chief, and the *pyсар*, the latter two dispatching affairs jointly in the *sotnyk's* absence.<sup>421</sup>

The chiefs were appointed in the same manner as the *sotnyky*; however, the recommendation for chief came from his *sotnyk*. As has already been stated, recruiting agents were often promoted to the rank of chief.<sup>422</sup> With the introduction of sub-ensigns into the regiment, chiefs were appointed from among them. The chiefs of a *sotnya* were under the direct orders of the regimental chancery. For instance, in the decree appointing a certain Kucherov as chief of the settlement Omel'nyts'ka, it was stated: "[He] shall not be under the command of other *sotnyky* of that settlement, but depend on the regimental chancery," except when the regimental chancery itself would put him under the command of a *sotnyk*.<sup>423</sup> There were both senior and junior

<sup>419</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 83.

<sup>420</sup> *IRIO*, XCIII, 1894, 27-9.

<sup>421</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 14.

<sup>422</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 107.

<sup>423</sup> *Ibid.*

chiefs but the differences in their rights and duties have not yet been ascertained.

The decree of the commander's chancery dating from 1756 introduced sub-ensigns in the Slobids'kyi regiment, a rank corresponding to that of aide-de-camp in "Little Russia" and similar to the same rank in Slobids'ki regiments. They were appointed from among *vyborni* Cossacks. The first appointees, seventeen in number, were commissioned by the commander's chancery upon recommendation of Captain Bykov ("assigned to the settlement") and the *sotnyky*. The sub-ensigns were to be responsible to the regimental chancery. The services of his father often had a decisive influence on a sub-ensign's appointment. Thus, *sotnyk* Delyatyns'ky's son was made sub-ensign in 1756; *sotnyk* Nedilko-Voynov's son Nicholas, then a minor, became a sub-ensign in 1757; the son of the late sub-ensign Ivan Kit, Michael Kotenko, in 1761, etc.<sup>424</sup>

Sometimes, chiefs and sub-ensigns were installed on solemn occasions. The first seventeen sub-ensigns were promoted on November 25, 1756, an anniversary of Empress Elizabeth's accession.<sup>425</sup> And in some cases, the new appointees gave presents to the authorities. For instance, in 1756 seven people were made sub-ensigns, one, a *sotnyk*, and one, a chief. They decided to make a collection and to give a length of yellow silk to Commander Glebov and a sugarloaf to Captain Bykov "in token of respect." The gifts were estimated at 19 rubles, 80 kopecks, so that every participant was to contribute 1 ruble 16 kopecks. Since the newly promoted chief Zvenyhorods'kyi, had no money, his share was paid by sub-ensign Lysyak. In 1761, Lysyak asked the garrison chancery for assistance in collecting this debt from Zvenyhorods'kyi and was quite specific in stating the purpose for which he had lent the sum. It appears, therefore, that this kind of "offering" was not considered illegal or improper.<sup>426</sup>

It is possible to obtain a fairly vivid picture of the position

<sup>424</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>425</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 68.

<sup>426</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 14.

enjoyed by the officers of the Slobids'kyi regiment, particularly those of the *sotni*. The absence of legal definitions regulating their activity enabled them to exploit the population and acquire great riches by any means. The material on the *sotnyky*'s activity is particularly rich, since many of the complaints against them have been preserved. This is not due to any exceptional inclination towards abuses on their part, but rather to the circumstance that the complaints were filed in the St. Elizabeth fortress, whose archives have come down to us; complaints against higher officials were passed on, if passed at all, to higher authorities. The order of 1758, issued by Colonel Odobash in connection with an action instituted against *sotnyk* Kalmaz for admitting Zaporozhians without passports, is interesting in this context. "*Sotnyky*," Odobash wrote, "are failing to execute the orders of the commander, owing to the leniency shown by Captain Bykov who administered the affairs of the Slobids'kyi regiment previous to my appointment." Odobash warned that he would severely punish and place under arrest all those disobeying his orders, and, generally speaking, "there will be no such leniency as in the time of Captain Bykov."<sup>427</sup> Unfortunately, it is not known whether the discipline in the regiment was changed. It can only be surmised that things continued as usual.

One occurrence of 1761 is revealing both of the attitude of the *sotnyky* towards the population and of the reaction of the authorities to their transgressions. The *sotnyk* of Domotkan', Matthew Sirenko, sent Cossacks of that locality to Chorny Lis, a distance of 150 versts. Their assignment was to fell trees for a house to be built for his stepson, *sotnyk* Ivan Sirenko. An investigation was ordered, in the course of which Ivan Sirenko declared that the Cossacks had been hired at a wage of 1 ruble, 50 kopecks per month. The commander, putting no faith in this deposition, issued a rather characteristic order, which ran in part as follows:

Many of the local inhabitants are fleeing, and for no other reason than oppression by the *sotnyky* and the use of the settlers for per-

<sup>427</sup> *Ibid.*

sonal services. Therefore the garrison chancery has decided to notify all the local settlers publicly that *sotnyky* and officers shall be punished for employing them [settlers] for personal services except for enlisting the services of their own *pidpomishnyky*. Since the *sotnyk* Ivan Sirenko has made a false deposition, he shall be mercilessly flogged at the guard house. His stepfather, Matthew Sirenko, shall be dismissed from his command for forcing the Domotkan' Cossacks to work and thereby wronging them.

All seems to have gone well, the commander intervened on behalf of the wronged Cossacks and severely punished the *sotnyky* for transgressing their powers. Unfortunately, all these decisions remained on paper. It is not known whether Ivan Sirenko was punished "mercilessly." As for his stepfather, Commander Murav'yov reinstated him a month and a half later with the following excuse: "Sirenko personally declared that no harm can possibly befall the Cossacks in the future on his account. Therefore, in view of his [previous] service, his temporary removal from the command shall be considered a sufficient substitute for punishment. Also, his transgression has not been overly serious."<sup>428</sup>

In other words, the commander, who had written that the actions of the *sotnyky* were forcing the population to flee, had reached the conclusion, after the *sotnyk's* "personal declaration," that the latter's offense was but minor. No more complaints against Matthew Sirenko are found among the acts of the fortress. It is difficult to decide whether this silence should be ascribed to his firm adherence to the promise given to the commander and his abstinence from harming the population, or to the population's decision that filing complaints against a *sotnyk*, who had been reinstated and given such a testimonial by a higher authority, was a hopeless undertaking. The latter conclusion is probably correct. It is not easy to imagine what a *sotnyk* would have to do to be ousted from his office upon the inhabitants' complaint. Another characteristic case deserves to be mentioned here. In 1759, the inhabitants of the settlement of Tyshkivka Ol'shanka complained to the regimental chancery

<sup>428</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 63, 68.

of *sotnyk*, Donets'. He was taking part in *haydamak* raids, and the settlement had been turned into a permanent nest of the *haydamaky*, who caroused and oppressed the inhabitants. Finally, they asked that the regimental chancery and officers either be moved to another settlement, or that they be given another *sotnyk*, for, "if *sotnyk* Nicholas Donets' continues to be our commander, there will be no possibility whatsoever of continuing to live in the settlement of Ol'shanka."<sup>429</sup> Nevertheless, Donets' was to retain his office for many years to come. Here is another example of a *sotnyk's* tyranny and the attitude of higher authorities toward it. *Sotnyk* Butovych, the regimental judge's brother, struck an inhabitant of Troynyts'ke, Tsebra, for the latter's failure to execute his order. Tsebra's son stood up for his father and swore at the *sotnyk*. Butovych had him whipped. "Having regained his composure," he offered an amicable settlement to the Tsebras, father and son, and was ready to give them thirty rubles "for arbitrariness and damages." The Tsebras demanded 100 rubles and sent a complaint to the garrison chancery, which ruled, however, that they had to accept the thirty rubles; as for Butovych, he was "vigorously reprimanded and ordered not to act inhumanely towards the inhabitants, but rather to be gracious with them, so as to encourage immigration."<sup>430</sup> Needless to say, the chiefs exploited the population no less than did the *sotnyky*; there was a good reason for the warning contained in the decree on appointments of chiefs that they were not to "take anything without paying for it."<sup>431</sup>

In 1761, Robota and Ustymovych arrived in St. Petersburg as the regiment's plenipotentiaries. They carried with them a statement from the regiment and Commander Murav'yov concerning the organization of the regiment, the admission of colonists, etc. The Senate explained that land was to be allotted separately and in accordance with each individual's rank: "Fol-

<sup>429</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 23 (reprinted in Yastrebov, "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yel.," *op. cit.*, pp. 564-66 in an abridged form).

<sup>430</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 76.

<sup>431</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 107.

lowing the repartition system of Nova Serbiya, . . . and to make such disposition of the lands that they, the Cossacks and other officers, may not dare to sell or pledge them to one another—except their buildings—and to establish the *sotni* on the same basis as the companies are organized in Nova Serbiya.”<sup>432</sup> In other words, this decree established officers grants for the officers of the Slobids’kyi regiment, and in this respect assimilated the Slobids’kyi regiment to Nova Serbiya and *Het’manshchyna*. The documents do not state clearly how large the shares of the *sotnyky* and other officers were. The existence of such allotments is attested in the petition of the *sotnyk* “of the Little Russian settlement attached to the St. Elizabeth fortress,” Lysanevych. Having been transferred there from Ol’shanka in 1761, he requested the regimental chancery to be allowed to retain his homestead near Ol’shanka, comprising a house and some arable land, until such time as land “would be allotted” to him in the new locality.<sup>433</sup>

The colonization of the territory destined for settlements proceeded at a rapid rate. This was due largely to the spontaneous movement of population. The Ukrainians of Nova Serbiya abandoned their homes either under the pressure of the strict measures ordering deportation of people “not covered by a decree,” or because of their reluctance to live with the Serbs and be subordinated to them. It is interesting to note that the exodus of the inhabitants of Nova Serbiya called forth a protest on the part of its administration, which was unwilling to lose the manpower whose function, according to the Senate’s decrees, was to serve to “the advantage of the Serbs.” When in 1761 several Ukrainian families moved to the settlement of Beshka from Khorvat’s settlement, the Beshka *sotnyk*, Grigori Zvenyhorodskyyi, did not dare to admit them on his own authority and asked the regiment’s chancery for instructions. The chancery, too, was reluctant to make a decision and approached the garrison chancery, which decided that if these families belonged to the population

<sup>432</sup> PSZ, No. 11312, August 14, 1761.

<sup>433</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 59.

“not covered by a decree” and had emigrated from Poland, they should be admitted “and similar cases shall be admitted in the future.”<sup>434</sup> Mel’gunov explained to Odobash in an order of 1763 that “old settlers have a full right to move from Nova Serbiya to the Slobids’kyi regiment and no one may prevent them from doing so.”<sup>435</sup>

Inhabitants of the Zaporozhian “Free Lands” also moved over into the settlements of the Slobids’kyi regiment, although in this case the authorities continually strove to check the influx of people without passports, fearing the infiltration of *haydamaky* disguised as settlers. Therefore, in a letter of 1754, Khorvat requested that Commander Glebov instruct the outpost commanders to deny passage through company entrenchments to all persons from the Sich not in possession of a passport.<sup>436</sup> The question of the passage of passportless people from the Sich was raised once again in 1760, and Murav’yov ordered “fugitives from the Sich” not to be admitted “without passports.”<sup>437</sup>

A considerable percentage of settlers in the Slobids’kyi regiment was furnished by the Left-Bank Ukraine and Slobids’ka Ukraine. The prospect of being able to settle down in a locality organized “on the model of the Slobids’ki regiments and not under the landlords’ rule” was so enticing that people from far away *sotni*, e. g. Khorol, Sorochyntsi, and Shyshaky, came there, not to speak of the *sotni* of Vlasivka, Kremenchuk, and Potik. The Myrhorod and Poltava colonels assailed the hetman with complaints, who passed them on to the Senate, asking that an end be put to the passage of Cossacks, *pidpomishnyky* and *pospolyti* to the Cossack settlement.<sup>438</sup> The Myrhorod colonel stated in his complaint, submitted in August 1758, that 201 people had fled from his regiment alone. In reply to all these grievances, the Senate confirmed its decisions against admitting emigrants from “Little Russia” and ordered them “to keep a watchful eye

<sup>434</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 21.

<sup>435</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 110.

<sup>436</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 3.

<sup>437</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 35.

<sup>438</sup> KTsADA, *Fond general’noi voisk. kantsel.*, No. 1489, p. 3 (new listing).

on and strictly supervise their subordinates, in order that only such people be admitted into the Cossack colony beyond the boundary of Nova Serbiya, whose admission has been ordered by the previous decrees of the Governing Senate. Under no pretext shall Little Russian people coming from Little Russia be admitted."<sup>439</sup> These severe decrees had no practical effect, however, and Commander Glebov's usual reply to the demands that the fugitives be extradited, was: "not a single one of them has appeared in the new Cossack colony."<sup>440</sup>

The bulk of the settlers came from the Right-Bank Ukraine, which was often but a stopping-off place for fugitives in transit from the Left-Bank, Slobids'ka Ukraine, or even Russia proper. The wave of immigrants from the Right-Bank was so great that in some cases they settled whole villages. In 1753, for instance, Commander in Chief Glebov reported to the Senate that the number of immigrants was mounting and that they already had formed a considerable settlement on the Ternivka River, and another one on the Vys'.<sup>441</sup> By a series of decrees, the Senate encouraged emigrants from the Ukraine and Russia to move from Poland to the Slobids'kyi regiment. Almost every year it deferred the term for "voluntary and safe" return, applying it to all "natural subjects, Great and Little Russians," including landlords' escaped serfs, Old Believers, and even military deserters.<sup>442</sup>

The Russian Old Believers, who since Peter the Great's time had sought refuge from "Nikon's heresy," conscription, and religious persecution in Poland and Moldavia, occupied a prominent place among the many groups of settlers coming from abroad. They had settled in considerable numbers in the provinces of Kiev, Bratslav,, Volhynia and Podolia. According to the information given to Hetman Rozumovs'kyi by the monks Theodosius (Feodosii) and Philaret (Filaret) there were

<sup>439</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1690, pp. 3-8.

<sup>440</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 14638 (old listing).

<sup>441</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 201-202.

<sup>442</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 45-6.



about thirty settlements with 50-100 households each in the Gomel' county (*starostva*) alone.<sup>443</sup>

The Russian government could not remain indifferent to this matter and repeatedly issued decrees which allowed Old Believers or, to use the expression of that time, dissenters (*raskol'niki*) to return to the territory of the Empire, guaranteed religious freedom to them, and freedom from taxation for a period of six years. Such was the tenor of the manifestoes of March 16, 1734 and September 4, 1735. The deadline for their return, January 1, 1757, was put off to July 1, 1758.<sup>444</sup> As a result of these decrees, groups of settlers, in ever-growing numbers, began to arrive in areas set aside for the Old Believers. They started to establish settlements apart from the Ukrainian population and to settle on the outskirts of the St. Elizabeth fortress, where they were inscribed on the rolls of merchants and "burgesses." On the other hand, they were considered as state settlers in the settlements. The Old Believers' settlements were: Zlynka, Klyntsi, and at a somewhat later date, Pishchanyi Brid, Lysa Hora, Kalynivka, Nykol's'ka, and others.<sup>445</sup> Old Believers coming from Poland were joined by a considerable group from Moldavia and by another from the Chernihiv region.<sup>446</sup>

The Old Believers' settlements enjoyed a particular status. They were subordinate to the fortress commander, but did not form a part of the regiment and had a superior of their own. The cavalry Captain Dmitri Popov, himself an Old Believer, was appointed to this office in 1761.<sup>447</sup> In spite of his fairly high rank, Popov did not have influence among his superiors. The commander's orders, brutal in tone, referred to him with the familiar pronoun (*Ty*) rather than the formal (*Vy*).<sup>448</sup> The

<sup>443</sup> M. I. Lilejev, *Iz istorii raskola na Vetke i v Starodub'ye v XVII-XVIII st.*, pp. 130, 291-93.

<sup>444</sup> *PSZ*, No. 6535, March 16, 1734; No. 6802, September 4, 1735.

<sup>445</sup> Skal'kovski, *Opyt statist. opisaniya*, I, 213; and his, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 75.

<sup>446</sup> Skal'kovski, "Russkiye dissidenty Novorossii" [Russian Dissenters in New Russia], *Kiyevskaya starina*, XVII, 1887, 772.

<sup>447</sup> *PSZ*, No. 11265, June 5, 1761.

<sup>448</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelisv.*, No. 25.

relations between the two must have been hostile, since Popov turned against Murav'yov in 1762 and was asked to be a witness in the case in Kiev.

However, Popov's powers in Old Believers' settlements were fairly broad. He admitted settlers and inscribed them on the rolls of settlers or townspeople "providing for their maintenance according to the regulations valid for the dissenters of Starodub."<sup>449</sup>

According to the original decree, the settlements of the Slobids'kyi regiment were destined for "native Russian subjects," but foreigners were admitted as well. Thus, Murav'yov asked the Senate through the regiment's plenipotentiaries, *sotnyky* Robota and Ustymovych, who were sent to St. Petersburg in 1761, what was to be done with the Moldavians who had stayed in Poland for a long time and now declared their desire to come over in entire settlements, "in any service whatsoever, without requiring any state subsidy, under the sole condition that they not be put under Khorvat." The Senate explained that the Moldavians could be admitted, enrolled among the Cossacks, and settled among the Ukrainian population.<sup>450</sup>

Not satisfied with voluntary arrivals, the government turned to the tried and true use of the recruiting agents, who undertook to people the settlements with settlers from Poland. These agents varied in social status; there were well-to-do settlers among them, for example, Vasyly Chernychenko of Orel, Semen Sych of Pletenyi Tashlyk, Nicholas Donets' of Tyshkivka.<sup>451</sup> Some of them were priests, e. g., the recruiting agents of Lykhivka, Pysarevs'kyi and others.<sup>452</sup>

Whereas colonization of Nova Serbiya by foreigners proceeded at a slow pace, the Ukrainian population of the Slobids'kyi regiment increased very rapidly. From the proceedings of one of the Senate's meetings, it appears that in 1755 the Cossack

<sup>440</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.* I, 30-31.

<sup>450</sup> *PSZ*, No. 11312, August 14, 1761.

<sup>451</sup> Yastrebov, "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yelisavety" *op. cit.*, pp. 357, 366, 418.

<sup>452</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, I, 210-11.

population of the St. Elizabeth fortress amounted to 3,411 families with 4,198 men above the age of fifteen.<sup>453</sup>

The following report of 1760 (Table 3) shows that there were 75 members on the staff, 4,363 Cossacks, 862 tenants and 108 churchmen in the regiment at that time. It also gives the regiment's strength, broken down according to service categories, as well as its distribution among the *sotni*, of which there were twenty-seven.<sup>454</sup>

Life in the Slobids'kyi regiment, "not under the rule of landlords," was far from easy for the majority of inhabitants. The exceedingly large number of complaints submitted by the population eloquently attests to the difficulties which beset the colonist in this area, not to speak of the officers' oppressive behaviour, arbitrariness, and venality. When these abuses were discussed previously, it was stated that higher authorities did not intervene on behalf of the oppressed, but rather connived at the actions of the *sotnyky* and chiefs. The authorities could not act otherwise, since they were guilty of the same sins: Commander Glebov accepted the gift of "yellow silk"; Commander Murav'yov was accused of oppressing the population; Judge Butovych took advantage of his office and seized land from the inhabitants of a settlement; in all this they were no better than the *sotnyky*.

Along with the abuses perpetrated by the authorities and the officers there existed, as it were, legal reasons for the population's suffering and ruin. As the *sotnyk* of the settlement of Tyshkivka, Zervanyts'kyi, "humbly reported" to the regiment's chancery in 1761, the *vyborni* Cossacks were poverty stricken because of the introduction of "mail" duties; they would not be able to perform military service, since they were forced to use their horses to carry mail. Therefore they asked to be relieved of this duty and hinted that this relief would be of benefit to the colonization of the region, for then people would be more eager to come from abroad. This argument, however, must have been to no avail, since new complaints against the excessive

<sup>453</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 451.

<sup>454</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 34.

burden of postal duty, submitted this time by *oboznyi* Mykhal'cha, reached the regimental chancery in 1763. The population also complained of the burden in furnishing quarters, since up to five men were assigned to each house.<sup>455</sup>

The status of homestead owners gave frequent occasion for complaints by the settlements. People of some means left the settlements for far away homesteads, where they "successfully" escaped all common obligations. The complaint of the inhabi-

TABLE 3

REPORT ON STRENGTH OF SLOBIDS'KYI REGIMENT  
November 1760

	<i>St. Elizabeth Fortress</i>	<i>Pushkariivka</i>	<i>Domolkan'</i>	<i>Borodaiivka</i>	<i>Myshuryn Rih</i>	<i>Kamyanka</i>	<i>Kalyuzhna</i>	<i>Boyans'ka</i>	<i>Omel'nyts'ka</i>	<i>Troynyts'ka</i>	<i>Zelena</i>	<i>Verbyuzhka</i>	<i>Ovnyanka</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Regimental Staff	10	1	2	3	2	1	—	4	1	—	4	2	2
<i>Sotnyky</i>	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1
Chiefs	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	—	1	1
<i>Pysary</i>	—	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	—	—	1	1
Ensigns	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	1	1	1
Captains	—	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	1
Gunners	—	2	3	2	1	1	—	1	1	2	—	1	2
<i>Vyborni Cossacks</i>	—	27	36	50	31	23	30	26	41	15	23	27	37
<i>Pidpomys'hyshnyky Cossacks</i>	—	199	237	297	208	123	213	121	258	102	751	142	175
Tenants	—	41	44	20	49	29	27	45	57	20	9	36	33
Churchmen	—	5	6	5	8	2	3	3	5	3	2	4	2
Total	2	278	331	378	301	181	278	202	368	144	788	215	254
Sum Total	12	279	333	381	303	182	278	206	369	144	792	217	256

<sup>455</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 94, 98.

tants of Ovnyanka, filed against gunners Olyferenko and Oliynykiv in 1763, is characteristic of this. The gunners had settled in homesteads of their own and demanded that their *pidpomishnyky* be sent to them from the settlement. In a lengthy report to the regimental chancery, *sotnyk* Avramenko complained of the gunners, stating that the transfer of *pidpomishnyky* to homesteads was not in the interests of the settlements' inhabitants and that, generally speaking, "these people have been recruited

<i>Beshka</i>	<i>Murzynka</i>	<i>Kamyanka</i>	<i>Adzhamka</i>	<i>Kalynivka</i>	<i>Inhul's'ka</i>	<i>Hruz'ka</i>	<i>Vys'</i>	<i>Pletenyi</i>	<i>Tashlyk</i>	<i>Krasna</i>	<i>Tyshkivka</i>	<i>Ternivka</i>	<i>Dobryanka</i>	<i>Orel</i>	<i>TOTAL</i>
14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27		
—	6	5	5	—	9	2	8	1	2	1	1	2	2		75
2	2	1	2	22	1	3	3	2	1	2	1	1	2		62
1	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		21
1	1	—	1	—	1	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	—		18
1	1	1	1	—	1	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	—		16
1	1	1	1	—	1	—	1	1	1	1	1	1	—		21
1	3	1	3	—	3	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—		30
31	74	28	46	3	21	54	26	232	22	9	32	10	6		960
146	153	145	281	18	114	232	14	97	72	50	145	42	28		4,363
30	93	28	54	1	83	43	17	18	30	15	32	4	4		862
2	7	7	5	2	7	4	5	4	5	2	5	4	1		108
216	336	213	395	47	232	339	69	357	134	81	218	63	41		6,461
216	342	218	399	47	241	341	77	358	136	82	219	65	43		6,536

not for the gunners' sake, but for the welfare of the state."<sup>456</sup> The complaint of the *sotnyk* of Adzhamka, Kyrylo Vovk, filed in 1764, points out that people living in homesteads, although they are enrolled in the *sotnya*, are not fulfilling their common obligations. The fishermen of Lake Revuche also shunned their duties, although they were listed among the inhabitants of the Kaluzhyns'ka settlement.<sup>457</sup>

The inhabitants of the Slobids'kyi regiment were poorly provided with land. Forests, like Chuta and Chorny Lis, fell to the lot of the Novoserbiyans, and lumber, dry wood, and building materials could be obtained only with the permission of the latter. The time-consuming business of fetching lumber from these far away places led to constant frictions and misunderstandings between the regiment and the people of Nova Serbiya. Sometimes the Serbs stopped the regiment's inhabitants and took wood away from them, etc. For instance, in 1760 the dwellers of Adzhamka were stopped by the hussars of Khorvat's regiment, arrested, and forced to work for them with their own oxen, which finally were also taken away from them.<sup>458</sup> It was not until 1764 that Commander in Chief Mel'gunov indicated in his order to Odobash that the people of Nova Serbiya had no right to hinder inhabitants of the Slobids'kyi regiment from going to Chorny Lis and bringing "wind fallen and dry wood" from there.<sup>459</sup>

In every respect, the lot of the Slobids'kyi regiment inhabitants was worse than that of the Nova Serbiya settlers. The area assigned to the settlement was so much smaller than that given to the companies of Hussars or Pandurs, that it did not suffice to support the colonists; they were forced to take or lease arable land, especially meadows, belonging to the Serbs. This practice prevailed chiefly among the settlements bordering on Nova Serbiya. The rent for a meadow was every third stack of hay;

<sup>456</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 83.

<sup>457</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 97, 98.

<sup>458</sup> Yastrebov, "Arkhiv Kreposti sv. Yelisavety," *op. cit.*, pp. 588-589; *Senatskii arkhiv*, XI, 322-23.

<sup>459</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 110.

it is not clear what the rent for arable land was. It has been stated above in discussing the case of Olishevski that the Pandurs were anxious to maintain these lease arrangements since they were freed from the necessity of tilling the land with their own hands.<sup>460</sup> Among those who leased land were the inhabitants of the settlements of Troynyt'ska, Murzynka, Koluzhyn'ska, Hruz'ka.<sup>461</sup> On the other hand, this situation was of little advantage to the people in the settlements who often fell into the Serbs' grip and were always exposed to their lawlessness and violence. The many complaints by the Slobids'kyi regiment people against the Serbs which have come down to us deal with such matters as obstacles put by the Serbs to the gathering of the mowed hay, of impounded cattle, compensation for damages, and so forth. These continuous quarrels forced Odobash to bar his people from entering the Nova Serbiya possessions: "[they shall not] wander into Nova Serbiya's grants under any pretext whatsoever or for any purpose."<sup>462</sup> This order, however, was difficult to enforce since the settlers' whole life made such "wandering" imperative. Of course, this is only one side of the picture; it would hardly be correct to see the Slobids'kyi regiment people as only victims, since we possess quite a few complaints by Serbs of wrongdoings committed by the regiment's inhabitants. Khorvat even complained to the Senate in 1760 that the settlers of Omel'nyk were harming and harassing his hussars "who had passed through two Empires" but still could not find peace.<sup>463</sup> One thing, however, should be stressed: Khorvat, omnipotent at that time, was always on the side of the Serbs, who, and this was even more important, were also supported by the Russian government. This was most strikingly shown during the affair of Commander Murav'yov who was accused of *defending* the population of the Slobids'kyi regiment. The instruction to his successor, Tolstoi, clearly stated that he should "solely and mainly

460 Yastrebov "Arkhiv Kreposti sv. Yelisavety," *op. cit.*, p. 574.

461 *Ibid.*, pp. 573, 574.

462 *Ibid.*, p. 570.

463 *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 11, No. 12.

protect the Nova Serbiya corps, show it all and every assistance to its satisfaction, and above all avoid the error of Murav'yov who disregarded Her Imperial Majesty's decrees concerning the founding of colonies there, protected the Cossack settlement at the fortress by his actions and. . . attempted by his intercessions to appropriate for them lands granted to Nova Serbiya."<sup>464</sup>

Class differentiation was rather pronounced in the Slobids'kyi regiment. The Cossack officer class turned all its energies towards enrichment and exploited the population subject to it in every way. Illegal demands for free labor, bribes, seizure of lands, and participation in *haydamak* raids—no device was disdained as too base. In fact, a few years after the founding of the Slobids'kyi regiment, we encounter many representatives of this officer class, chiefly *sotnyky*, as well-to-do estate owners, while some of them appear as important entrepreneurs. A few examples are appropriate.

Commander Glebov sent forty steers to Silesia in 1756.<sup>465</sup> In 1761 the cavalry Captain Ivanchenko complained about his shepherd Andriy, who fled after two hundred seventy-six sheep of the herd entrusted to him had been lost.<sup>466</sup> Matthew Sirenko, a *sotnyk* already known to the reader, dispatched ten wagons, each pulled by two oxen, to Zaporizhzhya, Poland and Turkey "for commercial purposes" in 1764. In 1763 the *sotnyk* of Kamyanka, Andriy Hehela, appeared as an important contractor, taking it upon himself to deliver 3,333 *chetverti* of oats to the provisions store of the fortress for 2,833 rubles, 5 kopecks. He fulfilled the contract.<sup>467</sup>

There is no doubt that the officers showed a liking for commerce, and it would be no exaggeration to say that every *sotnyk* took a part in it, more or less. The complaint of a Cossack of the Horodys'k *sotnya*, Hrihori Nosenko, is interesting. He bought several thousand sheepskins in the Slobids'kyi regiment in 1762 for delivery to Dokuchayev's factory in Moscow. The *sotnyk*

<sup>464</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XI, 368-71.

<sup>465</sup> *Zbirka N. D. Polons'koi-Vasylenko*.

<sup>466</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 68.

<sup>467</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 107, 118.



of Murzynka, Paul Dyk, took 2,228 sheepskins from this lot, without compensation, and passed them (probably for cash) to the merchant Sushylin.<sup>468</sup> The case of Sub-Ensign Paul Krokmal' who first engaged in trade by going to Zaporizhzhya for sheep, etc., and later had himself inscribed among the merchants of the St. Elizabeth fortress, also deserves mention here.<sup>469</sup>

It is difficult to gain an insight into the living conditions of the officers at that time, since only random information on the subject is available. We know, for instance, that a fire in 1764, which broke out in Pushkarivka in the Domotkan' *sotnya*, consumed the residence of the "discharged *sotnyk*" Ivan Sirenko. Among the property destroyed were: three houses, two storehouses, items belonging to the household, such as grain, wagons, sleighs "and other things, of more than two hundred rubles value, his commission as a *sotnyk*, documents on various matters, and bonds worth more than a hundred rubles."<sup>470</sup> It is interesting to note that a simple *sotnyk* should possess "documents on various matters" and had invested a considerable part of his capital in bonds.

A small, but nevertheless noteworthy group of persons who acquired money through commercial operations stand out from among the mass of Cossacks and settlers. Every year, passes which authorized settlement inhabitants, Cossacks and *pidpomishnyky*, to proceed to various localities "for business purposes," were issued by the regimental chancery. The Cossacks Shvets' and Naydenko asked for passes in 1764 to proceed from Vys' to the Zaporozhian Sich, where they planned to purchase horses. In 1763, the Cossacks Stots'kyi and Voroniv of Inhul went to Poland in two wagons loaded with fish.<sup>471</sup> The inhabitant of Tyshkivka, Reva, went to Turkey to trade in 1762.<sup>472</sup> In the same year, an inhabitant of Krasna, Kuz'menko, asked the regimental chancery for assistance in obtaining the sum of sixty-six rubles

<sup>468</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 93.

<sup>469</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 107.

<sup>470</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 63, 117. Perhaps he was dismissed as a result of the complaint against him which was mentioned earlier.

<sup>471</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 107.

<sup>472</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 89.

from the Zaporozhian Cossack, Korzh, who had signed a promissory note for that amount.<sup>473</sup> This list could be continued, since the fortress archives contain many more documents of this kind.

We have tried to outline different aspects of the social and economic conditions of life in the Slobids'kyi regiment. In conclusion, it may be certainly said that negative features were prevalent there. First, the complete arbitrariness of the officers, their impunity, fully realized by the officers themselves, and the absence of any legal protection for the inhabitants' interests, who could not appeal against oppression. Secondly, the difficult economic conditions; there were no forests in the majority of settlements. Lumber had to be obtained from forests allotted to the Novoserbiyans; these forests were from 150 to 200 kilometers away. The area granted to the settlers was insufficient; they lacked meadows, pasture grounds, etc. This picture applied to the regiment as a whole, and the general conditions were made worse by a particular feature, varying in condition from place to place, namely, relations with neighbors. The regiment's relations with its northern neighbor, Nova Serbiya, have already been discussed. They were not much better in the south, where the regiment bordered upon the Zaporozhian lands, and in the west, where the Poles were the neighbors.

Not all Ukrainian inhabitants "not covered by decree" left Nova Serbiya. The original decision to deport them immediately was soon replaced by a compromise, which permitted them to remain, so they might "serve to the advantage" of its new rulers by providing the latter with living quarters, provisions, seed, etc.<sup>474</sup> And Khorvat and his Serbs soon learned to appreciate the advantage which they were able to derive from the services of the local population and took the initiative in asking that the population "not covered by a decree," be left in Nova Serbiya. In her decree of October 31, 1752, addressed to the hetman, the Empress Elizabeth referred to a report of Khorvat, in which he had assured her that it was difficult to prevent people "not

<sup>473</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 107.

<sup>474</sup> *PSZ*, No. 10148, November 9, 1753.

covered by a decree" from escaping to Poland, and that many desired to remain on the territory allotted to the Serbs and "obey and assist them in household duties." Since officers and the rank and file "could not, of course, do without assistance," they asked for permission to admit these people as tenants on their lands. This request was not granted. On the contrary, Elizabeth confirmed the order prohibiting the inhabitants from moving back to Poland, and decreed that they should rather return to the localities from which they had escaped to Poland once before.<sup>475</sup>

These, however, were not enforced and a Senate decree was issued upon Khorvat's request on September 1, 1754, which permitted the remaining population "not covered by a decree" to stay in Nova Serbiya. Experience had shown that the newcomers could not rely upon their own resources, especially since they were not inclined to work. Therefore a joint report of all the representatives of the Nova Serbiya administration, i. e., of Commander in Chief Glebov, Khorvat, and Commandant Glebov, was submitted to the Senate. This document requested that permission to remain in Nova Serbiya be given to inhabitants who did not own homes and to "propertyless" people who were voluntarily serving in the households of the Serbian settlers as hired labor. The Senate granted this request but attached some conditions to its consent: such people were to be hired for a definite term and a list of hired workers was to be made and submitted to Khorvat. Both these points called forth a protest from Khorvat, who saw in them a possible source of difficulty for the "newly-arriving people." Therefore he asked that no limit be put on the term for which labor was hired and no lists be made of "those whose sole means of support are in wages or payment in kind." Such conditions, Khorvat argued, would be interpreted as an offense by the newcomers. Should the rumor of these conditions reach prospective colonists, it might have an adverse effect on "their willingness to emigrate." Yielding to this reasoning, the Senate permitted *all* those who "desired

<sup>475</sup> Bibl. Ukr. Akad. Nauk. *Zbirka O. M. Lazareus'koho*, No. 63, p. 112.

to work as hired hands" to be employed for a certain time with the knowledge of the commander.<sup>476</sup> It is interesting to note that the decree attests to the desire of the new rulers of the land to use hired labor; even more important are the references to "propertyless" people, who hired themselves out for wages or for "payment in kind" alone.

All kinds of craftsmen, or, as the terminology of the time had it, "artists" (*khudozhniki*), i. e. craftsmen, such as blacksmiths, carpenters, etc., soon received the legal right to reside in Nova Serbiya, where an urgent need was felt for this kind of specialized worker.<sup>477</sup> This need may be inferred from the correspondence between Khorvat and the Governor of Smila, Dobryanski. The Governor was accused by Khorvat of having enticed a mason and stovemaker, Horbatyi by name. Khorvat required Dobryanski to have Horbatyi returned to Novomyrhorod; he wrote that winter was near, and "by great effort" he had procured the necessary materials for stoves to be built in his house; now, with the mason's departure, all these materials were "useless."

Orderlies (*den'shchyky*) of the officers of Nova Serbiya were the third category of Ukrainians legally entitled to residence in Nova Serbiya. At first, Khorvat obtained permission for officers of Hussar and Pandur regiments to have orderlies brought from abroad and settled on the ranks' lands, since, he maintained, these officers, not having "Great Russian villages," could not administer their possessions without the help of orderlies. A colonel was entitled to twelve orderlies' households; a lieutenant colonel, to eight; a first major, to six; a captain, to four; officers below a captain's rank to two. For himself, Khorvat obtained the right to settle an unlimited number of people on lands allotted to him in two regiments. The Senate permitted him to use foreign immigrants, but prohibited the admission of fugitives from *Het'manshchyna* and Slobids'ka Ukraine.<sup>478</sup> In practice, the actual number of orderlies was much higher

<sup>476</sup> PSZ, No. 10148, November 9, 1753.

<sup>477</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 10288, September 1, 1754.

<sup>478</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 11058, May 10, 1760; KTADA, *Fond gener. voisk. kantsel.*, No. 14638.

than the figure that was authorized. While this figure amounted to 263 people for the whole of Nova Serbiya, in 1763 the Pandur regiment alone had 347, with 443 male and 764 female members of their families, the sum total thus being 1,554 persons of both sexes. In 1761 the Hussar regiment had 84 orderlies, their families numbered 126 male and 176 female members respectively, totaling 386 persons. The number of orderlies (excluding their families) in two regiments alone was almost twice as high as the figure foreseen for the whole of Nova Serbiya.

Table 4 shows the figures for the Ukrainian population in Khorvat's Hussar regiment. There were 231 male hired workers, and 416 members of their families; 84 orderlies with 302 family members of both sexes; 94 persons "not covered by a decree" and authorized to stay, with 374 members of their families; 52 craftsmen of various trades, with 149 members of their families; finally, 403 inhabitants who were not in a service relationship with the Serbs, with 1,385 members of their families. The sum total was 864 heads of families, 1,942 male and 1,636 female members of their families, i. e., 3,490 persons in all.<sup>479</sup>

When the admission of Ukrainians into the regiments of Nova Serbiya was previously discussed, it was pointed out that the number of people, both Cossacks and *pospolyti* coming from *Het'manshchyna* and Slobids'ka Ukraine to Nova Serbiya was considerable and that the authorities were powerless to stop this influx. This observation applies even more to the Slobids'kyi regiment, where the authorities ignored the immigration from the Left-Bank Ukraine.

Of course, the waves of fugitives from the Left-Bank often arrived in Nova Serbiya via the Right-Bank Ukraine. Khorvat completely disregarded the government's orders which prohibited the admission of Ukrainian and Russian population from Poland. Not only were these immigrants gladly received in Nova Serbiya, but regular incursions into the neighboring Polish provinces of Smila and Savran' were organized by Khorvat for

<sup>479</sup> *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, No. 1343.

TABLE 4  
UKRAINIAN POPULATION IN KHORVAT'S HUSSAR REGIMENT

Name of Retrenchment	HIRED WORKERS ORDERLIES						Population not Covered by Decree						CRAFTSMEN of Various Trades Service Relation						Population Not in Families		TOTAL
	Families		Families		Families		Families		Families		Families		Families		Families		Male	Female			
	Heads of Families	Female	Heads of Families	Female	Heads of Families	Female	Heads of Families	Female	Heads of Families	Female	Heads of Families	Female	Heads of Families	Female	Heads of Families	Female	Heads of Families	Male	Female		
Novomyrhorod	28	10	26		2	1	5		3	3		3	3		3	35	40	74	230		
Pichka	20	11	21						2	2					3	36	36	67	227		
Petrostriv	19	11	27		42	59	98									1			257		
Nadlad	20	21	23		6	7	9								3	5	4	21	126		
Kalnybolot	14	8	13		15	28	30								3	5	4	1	124		
Semlek	18	14	15		10	14	20								2	3	2		98		
Novoarkhangel'sk	18	13	18						7	11	10	7	3	9	13	14	17	17	140		
Martonosh	16	8	11						1	3	3	3	7	7	3	5	5	3	80		
Panchov	11	6	18						2	3	3	3	6	9	9	29	52	76	220		
Kanyzh	8	7	9												8	2	1	5	32		
Sentiv	13	12	18		4	6	7								7	13	4	4	98		
Bukovar	2	4	2													32	64	74	178		
Fedvar	8	11							1						2	38	42	94	201		
Subotitsa	5	1	2						3	2	7					7	4	10	41		
Tsybuliv	8	11	12						8	12	21	2	3	5	54	99	138	373			
Mashoryn	3								8	10	18					18	22	31	110		
Dmytrivka	8	7	14						22	34	53	5	10	11	54	9	14	25	350		
Sambor	4	3	4						7	9	13				13	15	20	39	195		
Hlyns'k	3	2	6						17	34	53				3	15	20	39	195		
Bershats	5	8	9						16	21	48	4	7	9	40	62	89	318			
Total:	231	157	259	84	126	176	176	94	140	234	52	62	87	87	403	494	891	3,490			

the purpose of bringing settlers from there. *Haydamaky*, who had been arrested, testified in 1756 that Khorvat had instructed the recruiting agent of Savran', Movchan, and the *haydamak* Yus'ko Taban, to recruit people in Poland. Khorvat proffered specious excuses and sought to place the blame on others; his protectors hushed up the affair.<sup>480</sup>

Towns began to grow up in Nova Serbiya from the very beginning of the colonization. They were: Novomyrhorod, Khorvat's headquarters and the administrative center of the Nova Serbiya corps and, consequently, the center of the foreign settlements; and the St. Elizabeth fortress, the residence of the commander in chief of Nova Serbiya, of the fortress commander, of the colonel of the Slobids'kyi regiment, in short, the center of the Russian administration of the region. The external appearance of these localities and the part they played in the life of the region have been discussed above.

Settlers began to come to the St. Elizabeth fortress and its suburbs before the fortress was completed. As early as 1754, Brigadier Glebov asked Commander in Chief Glebov to send a surveyor to the fortress to allot plots of land to settlers who wanted to establish themselves in its suburbs, since the applications from prospective settlers were already considerable.<sup>481</sup> One of the first among these volunteer settlers may have been the serf of Count P. B. Kurakin, Ivan Sedel'nikov, who was allowed to leave the village Voshchynino (Rostov district) on condition that he pay a quitrent (*obrok*). He had been a sutler in the Tver infantry regiment, stationed in Petroostriv. Having heard of the building of the fortress, he hastened there and opened a food shop.<sup>482</sup> An interesting report on the inhabitants of the burges's suburb or the *Mishchans'ka* settlement, as it was called, dating from 1757, is available. At that time, there were ninety-five burges's households in the settlement; of them, seventy persons came from various parts of Nova Serbiya; twenty-

<sup>480</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 411, 556-65; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, V, 1027-1028; Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 149-50.

<sup>481</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 3, sheet 16.

<sup>482</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1, sheet 27.

eight from the Right-Bank Ukraine; six from Zaporizhzhya; one from Kiev; four from the Left-Bank Ukraine.

Besides owners of households, the report mentions twenty-one burgesses who did not have property (*bezdvorni*) and lived as tenants. It also mentions eleven burgesses who were "sheltered" by various persons, such as, the *sotnyk* Kasay, provost Hrygor'yev, Sub-Ensign Kupchenko, Catherine Tavrovs'ka and others. The list goes on to mention three Greeks from the Crimea and fourteen "outsiders" who traded in their own or rented shops and did not belong to the local burgesses. Among them, three came from Moldavia; one, from the Sich, one, from the Slobids'kyi regiment; two, from Poland; one, from Nova Serbiya and five, from Great Russia (from Gorokhovets, Bolkhov, Bryansk, Borovs'k, Putivl'; one, "a Great Russian. . . came from Romny." These indications are especially valuable, since they permit us to establish the settlers' origin.<sup>483</sup>

The Old Believers colony began to grow in the suburbs from the fortress' very beginnings. The most successful merchants, such as the Senkovski brothers, who engaged in large-scale trade, were Old Believers.

Old Believers mostly came from the Right-Bank Ukraine, to which they had fled from Russia. The testimonies of some of them, accused of proselytizing among the Orthodox, are interesting in this context. Ivan Malyugin and Yegor Loskutov, for instance, testified that they had emigrated from Bryansk county, were peasants, had suffered much, and had been sold by Count F. A. Apraksin to the manufacturer Goncharov, they had worked in the latter's textile factory, but could not stand the cruel treatment there; they had fled to Poland, from which they finally moved to the St. Elizabeth fortress, having learned about the manifesto allowing the return of fugitives from Poland.<sup>484</sup> In 1762, upon the request of the Old Believers, the Senate authorized them to enroll as merchants, wear beards and dress in their customary garments. It also put them under the garrison

<sup>483</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 10, sheets 6-11.

<sup>484</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 69.



chancery, which was instructed to protect the Old Believers from any harm and to prohibit any merchant from Russia to open shops and settle in the fortress.<sup>485</sup> Thus the Senate recognized the Old Believers' exclusive right to trade in the St. Elizabeth fortress.

In addition to the Old Believers, emigrants from Zaporizhzhya, the Left-Bank Ukraine, and Russia settled in the fortress. They were joined by a small Greek community which was to grow larger in later years. The oldest documents attesting to the existence of Greek settlers in the suburbs of the St. Elizabeth fortress date from 1754. They have been preserved in the Greek church of the fortress. At first, the number of Greeks was small. In the fifties of the century there were about fifty of them, mostly from Macedonia. Others came from Constantinople, Austria, Venice, or Nizhyn. It is interesting that the archives of the Greek community should not mention any Greeks from the Crimea, while the list of 1757 from the archives of St. Elizabeth fortress shows only Crimean Greeks. By and large, the Greeks sold brandy, Crimean wines, or groceries; some of them were artisans. It appears from passports issued to the Greeks that they made business trips to Nova Serbiya, the Sich, Poland, *Het'manshchyna*, Russia, but, above all, they traded with Turkey.<sup>486</sup>

The beginning of the self-government of the Greek community occurs in the same period. It had an elected town council, but the mayor was apparently appointed by the fortress commander. The first mayor, Ivan Ivanchenko, was dismissed in 1757, and Grigori Zvenyhorods'kyi was named to succeed him by Glebov, who had consulted Khorvat on the matter. In 1761, Ivan Homon was the mayor; in 1763, Ivan Nizhynets', and in 1766, Terentiy Chornyi.<sup>487</sup> The town council depended on the commander and the garrison chancery in all matters. It could not even issue passports to "Little Russia" or Russia without the approval of the garrison's or the commander's chancery.

<sup>485</sup> *PSZ*, No. 11683, October 16, 1762.

<sup>486</sup> Yastrebov, "Greki v Yelisavetgrade," *op. cit.*, VI, 673-74.

<sup>487</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 10, 27, 31, 107, 129.

Information on the town council's activity is scanty. Some scattered data help form an idea of the general situation. The authority of the council and the mayor was very slight, since neither was able to curb the insubordination of individual members of the community. One occurrence of 1761 is characteristic in this respect. Ensign Danylo Fedorenko and his business partners, Vasyl' Tokar and Ivan Kukhar, had bought cloth from Yas'ko and Ivan Kabuzan, incurring a debt of 130 rubles. After the cloth had been sold, an account was made in the town hall in the presence of the town authorities and the chief of the *sotnya*. It was established that Fedorenko's part of the debt was nineteen rubles, fifty kopecks. But Yas'ko and Ivan Kabuzan demanded forty-three rubles, and Fedorenko declared, "without approaching the proper authorities, they arbitrarily put me under guard in the town hall, shut me up in the office, put chains on me, and beat up my flanks. All this was done in the presence of Mayor Ivan Homon." Homon asked them to desist, but they did not, declaring, "We shall put chains on him at our expense, even if it costs us twenty rubles." Fedorenko's arrest did not last long. As soon as the Kabuzans had left, he was released by Homon.<sup>488</sup> The affair is rather interesting. It shows that the authorities had no power to enforce the law and illustrates the means used in the town hall to "influence" people by imprisonment and chains when they resisted. It is also noteworthy that the Kabuzans should threaten to chain Fedorenko at their own expense, even at the cost of as much as twenty rubles.

One more detail deserves attention. The town council acted as notary public in cases of misunderstanding and it was there that business partners computed profits and received their shares. "Putting in chains" was apparently a method frequently used; in 1763 a complaint was filed, this time against Mayor Nizhynets', who had chained the burgess Koval' to a chair only to release him the next day and ask his pardon for this unjust

<sup>488</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 68.

and undeserved treatment.<sup>489</sup> This example shows that "putting in chains" was widely practiced and did not imply a serious crime on the part of the accused.

In more serious cases, the offenders were not kept in the town hall, but sent to the commander. In 1757 the burgess Kotlyar, arrested for participation in *haydamak* raids, was sent by Mayor Zvenyhorods'kyi to Commander Glebov in stocks, who handed Kotlyar over to the chancery of the Slobids'kyi regiment for investigation.<sup>490</sup>

#### VIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE COLONIZATION OF NOVA SERBIYA AND SLAVYANOSERBIYA

It is not easy to assess the importance of foreign colonization in the life of the Southern Ukraine or to determine to what extent the foreign settlements fulfilled the tasks assigned to them by the State.

The main task of the foreign colonists in Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya was the protection of the Russian Empire's southern frontiers from possible Turkish and Tatar invasions. In addition, the government desired to secure the frontier against Zaporozhian incursions. Such was the opinion of A. A. Skal'kovski, who wrote that the first attempt to turn the steppe into a Christian, or Russian, territory and to make it into a barrier against Turks, Tatars and Zaporozhians, occurred in Empress Elizabeth's reign.<sup>491</sup> The foregoing discussion has shown that this goal was not reached. Neither in Nova Serbiya nor in Slavyanoserbiya did the authorities succeed in recruiting the expected contingent of soldiers, not to speak of the fact that a considerable part of these soldiers consisted not of foreigners but of Russian subjects. And, furthermore, at no time during the existence of

<sup>489</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 105.

<sup>490</sup> Skal'kovski, "Neskol'ko dokumentov iz istorii Gaidamachiny" [Several Documents from the History of the *Haydamaky*] *Kiyevskaya starina*, XIII, 1885, 295, 305, 306.

<sup>491</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 12.

Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya did the foreign colonies prove a strong, reliable barrier in either of these regions. Yet, when the Russian government recruited what it believed to be experienced warriors, it had all reasons to expect that they would provide such a protective belt. Far from that, it appears that these colonies had to be constantly protected by both the regular and auxiliary units of the Russian army.

A few examples will illustrate this point. At the outset, when Khorvat was concluding the contract, as it were, with the Russian government, he demanded that a fortress be constructed by Russian subjects and a strong permanent Russian garrison be stationed there.<sup>492</sup> On January 1, 1752, the Senate considered the report of the Military College on the dispatching of 3,000 regular and auxiliary troops to the localities beyond the Dnepr. These units were ordered to fight against the *haydamaky* and "to protect the recent Serbian settlers in case of an enemy attack."<sup>493</sup> Khorvat demanded that these troops remain during the winter of 1752-53. Glebov, in opposing this plan, pointed out that the Cossacks would have no living quarters, since the Serbs, having bought up all the houses of the "population not covered by a decree," refused to admit them. As usual, the Senate sided with Khorvat, ordered the Cossacks to stay and be billeted on the Serbs "proportionately," should there be no houses of the "population not covered by a decree."<sup>494</sup> In the same year, a unit, 500 strong, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel von Finiks, was stationed along the line Hard, Synyukha, Sukhyi Tashlyk, Arkhangel's'k, Petroostriv, Tsybuliv, to "search for *haydamaky*."<sup>495</sup> A unit of "territorial militia" under Second Major Bibikov, was assigned to the same region.<sup>496</sup> In 1753, the Senate decreed that 1,200 men from regular Dragoon and "territorial militia" regiments, commanded by staff and company officers, as well as 2,000 Cossacks and officers from the company

<sup>492</sup> PSZ, No. 9921, December 29, 1751.

<sup>493</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 659.

<sup>494</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 710-11.

<sup>495</sup> Andriyevski, *Materialy*, pp. 238-9.

<sup>496</sup> *KTsADA*, No. 14696.

(*kompaniiski*) and Ukrainian regiments, 3,200 men in all, should be maintained in Nova Serbiya "for the protection of the frontiers and the Serbian settlements and for the extirpation of *haydamaky*."<sup>497</sup> Glebov requested a unit of 200 men from the Zaporozhian Host for the defense of the St. Elizabeth fortress. Accordingly, an Imperial decree of 1754 instructed the hetman to issue the necessary orders to the Zaporozhian camp chief.<sup>498</sup> This procedure was repeated in 1755.<sup>499</sup> These measures might be justified by the recent founding of the Serbian colonies, which at this time were unable to organize their own military force. Later years, however, brought no change. In 1755 the Senate considered a new request by Khorvat asking that an army unit or "territorial militia" cavalry regiments be sent to Nova Serbiya. To protect the Serbian settlements whose thirty-three entrenchments, he argued, situated at the frontier, were under constant threat of foreign attack. The Senate acquiesced in this request once more and put the unit under Khorvat's command.<sup>500</sup> It is interesting to note that in this case Khorvat asked for protection of the entrenchments, whose avowed purpose was to protect the region. Other more eloquent cases may be cited. As the *haydamak* incursions grew more frequent in 1755, Colonel Khorvat asked Commander Glebov to assist him with troops, since his hussars "do not show the slightest enthusiasm" for carrying on the struggle. The cynism of the colonel is striking. Other similar requests, this time unmotivated, are known. In 1756, General Khorvat successfully petitioned the Senate to raise the number composing the army regiments assigned to the struggle against the *haydamaky* to 700 men.<sup>501</sup> In the same year the Senate decided to send up to 1,000 men from the "Little Russian," instead of the "territorial militia," regiments to Nova Serbiya "so that this region may not remain unpopulated."<sup>502</sup>

<sup>497</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, VIII, 198.

<sup>498</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 86-7, 109-10, 114-16, 123-24.

<sup>499</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 353-55, 365.

<sup>500</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 6.

<sup>501</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, IX, 484.

<sup>502</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 600-601, 684.

Rumors of the approach of Edisan hordes and Turkish troops spread in 1758. Khorvat and Commander Yust argued before the Senate that Nova Serbiya was badly protected, since it was covered only by the Perm Dragoon regiment, 2,000 Cossacks from "Little Russia" regiments, 1,000 Don Cossacks and a unit of Meshcheryaks and Kazan Tatars. Therefore Khorvat asked for five more regiments, while Yust requested only one.<sup>503</sup> It is curious that neither of them took the Novoserbiyan regiments into account. This time Khorvat and Yust's petition was supported by the Army Commander, Lopukhin. The Senate ordered the Astrakhan Grenadiers, one "territorial militia" and one army infantry regiment to move to Nova Serbiya in 1759.<sup>504</sup> It could not have acted otherwise, since it was not possible to argue with the local commanders that the region was sufficiently protected.

Interesting materials on the region's defenses have been preserved in the St. Elizabeth fortress' archives. The southern frontier, i. e., the Slobids'kyi regiment's territory, was protected by this regiment's outposts and by units of company and "Little Russian" regiments. Moreover, units of the Russian army were stationed in the settlement. In 1758, 1,000 Don Cossacks, commanded by Chief Grekov, three companies of Orenburg Meshcheryaks, commanded by Prince Chula Ibrayev, and a unit of Kazan' Tatars under First Major Trunov, were billeted in six settlements, in addition to a 1,500 man unit gathered from the Hadyach, Myrhorod, Poltava, Pereyaslav and Lubny regiments.<sup>505</sup> In 1764, their number went up to 3,800 men. These units rotated every three or four months.<sup>506</sup>

It may be seen from the report submitted to Prince Meshcherski, who arrived in Nova Serbiya in 1762, that the strength of various army units protecting Nova Serbiya was superior to

<sup>503</sup> *Ibid.*, X, 582-83.

<sup>504</sup> *Ibid.*, XI, 1-2.

<sup>505</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yehysav.*, Nos. 12, 19.

<sup>506</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 201-203.

the effective strength of its regiments. The figures of this report are given in Table 5.<sup>507</sup>

TABLE 5  
MILITARY EFFECTIVES IN NOVA SERBIYA

	<i>Normal Strength</i>	<i>Present</i>	<i>Absent</i>
Khorvat's Hussar Regiment	1864	1086	778
Novomyrhorod Garrison	344	338	6
Pandur Regiment	412	391	21
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2620</b>	<b>1815</b>	<b>805</b>
Ukrainian Corps Command	—	541	—
Artillery Command	—	60	—
Various "Little Russian" Regiments	—	602	—
Protection of the Outposts	—	1235	—
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2438</b>	

The situation was no better in the east. Units of 150 men each, rotating every two months, were dispatched from each Slobids'kyi regiment to Slavyanoserbiya.<sup>508</sup>

These facts illustrate the real value of the "model" military colonies, organized by the government in Nova Serbiya at such a great expense. The Serbs were not even able to protect their own settlements. Therefore the following words of A. A. Skal'kovski have a sarcastic connotation, although they were dictated by his sentiments of loyalty and the tradition of unconditional approval of all the actions undertaken by the Imperial administration: "A living wall of courageous troops, always ready to defend the frontiers from wicked neighbors, appeared in Nova Serbiya with the arrival of the Serbs."<sup>509</sup> Count N. Panin, Nova Serbiya's contemporary and one of the wisest statemen of the eighteenth century, held a different opinion of this "living wall."

<sup>507</sup> *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 47, No. 965. p. 153 of original.

<sup>508</sup> P. Golovinski, *Slobodskiye kozach'i polki*, pp. 186-87.

<sup>509</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronologi. obozr...*, I, 59.

He wrote in his "Notes" of 1767 that it was more advantageous to the state to pull all the population out from Nova Serbiya than to maintain Serbian settlements there.<sup>510</sup>

The organization of the military forces of Nova Serbiya is illustrated by reports of Colonel Spichinski and by other documents bearing on the investigation of the Khorvat affair. Without mentioning the fact that none of the units was fully manned, many soldiers were carried on the rolls, already small in number, who were on leave. Many of them were abroad, supposedly recruiting soldiers or bringing their families to Nova Serbiya, but their salaries were being paid during their absence. Often salaries were listed as paid out to dead persons or fugitives. Some soldiers were unfit for service on account of age, bodily disability, "blindness from birth," or minority. It came out that the Hussar regiment had eighty-four such soldiers; the Novomyrhorod garrison, thirty-four; the Pandur regiment, forty-one. The total figure for the Nova Serbiya Corps amounted to 159.<sup>511</sup>

During the Seven Years War, the only war in which the Nova Serbiya corps participated, furnishing a unit of 1,000 men, Khorvat began to form two new Hussar field, not settlement, regiments, the Macedonian and the Bulgarian, manned exclusively by young, unmarried men.<sup>512</sup> Kostyurin and Pišćević, the author of the *Memoirs* often quoted on these pages, were put in command of these troops. The same abuses which had occurred during the formation of the settlement regiments were repeated here. The shortage of manpower was acute; moreover, recruits often deserted, sometimes with weapons and ammunition.<sup>513</sup>

It is safe, then, to conclude that the principal task of the set-

<sup>510</sup> Odes'k. ist. Muzei, *Rukop. Zbirka "Odessk. Obshchestva"*, H-30-64, pp. 137-41.

<sup>511</sup> *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 38, No. 825; file 45, No. 926; Skal'kovski *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 81.

<sup>512</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 49, 85-6, 93, 97, 98, 383; *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file 38, No. 825; file 45, No. 926; A. Shmidt, in passing, mentions that an entire Hussar regiment of Khorvat's went to the war, cf. *Materialy*..., I, 37.

<sup>513</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 34; *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, Issue XVI, pp. 124-25.



tlements, the providing of reliable military protection, was not fulfilled. The situation was no better with respect to the second task, the creation of agricultural colonies. As Bestuzhev-Ryumin pointed out, the Serbian settlement regiments should have entailed no expense for the state. Theoretically, the rank and file and their families were to guarantee an orderly economy in the regiments, while the ranks' lands were to provide for officers' needs. The practice, however, differed from these expectations. It has already been said that not only officers but also rank-and-file Serbs showed no inclination towards farming and employed every means in order to use the local population as free or forced labor.

Many instances of unlawful exploitation of the Ukrainian population by the Serbs, e. g., for field work, felling trees, transporting lumber, etc., have previously been quoted. A series of agreements between companies of the Pandur and settlers of the Slobids'kyi regiment who took leases on the fields and meadows, so bountifully allotted to the Serbs, were mentioned. Analogous occurrences in Slavyanoserbiya have also been pointed out. All these facts show that instead of colonists able and willing to work, the region acquired foreign exploiters, who wanted to live by the labour of the "population not covered by a decree," which had been sacrificed to them.

Pišćević's memoirs contain a number of interesting passages which show the helplessness of the foreign colonists in Slavyanoserbiya, once they were left to their own resources. In their country, they had not been husbandmen, but professional soldiers, *condottieri* of sorts, sometimes even simple vagabonds. For a long time, these foreigners were not able to adjust to the new conditions of life. Never having been farmers, they did not know "what it meant to build up and establish a household." They did not know how to plough, or sow, or do any agricultural work. "I did not know what to do," Piščević wrote about himself, "or where to begin, since I had never farmed before. Whatever I undertook turned into the opposite. I could not succeed in anything."<sup>514</sup> At the same time, Piščević remarked that the

<sup>514</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, pp. 185, 190.

local population was unwilling to cooperate with the foreigners or sell them anything.

Little is known about the relations between the settlers of Slavyanoserbiya and their neighbors. In this respect, the information on Nova Serbiya is better. The following case provides an interesting insight into the situation. In 1761 the Zaporozhian Camp informed the Main Chancery of the Nova Serbiya corps that it had prohibited the Zaporozhian Cossacks from bringing their horses and cattle to fairs in Novomyrhorod and other localities of Nova Serbiya, as a result of molestation, theft, robbery, and arbitrary actions perpetrated by the Serbs.<sup>515</sup> And yet it would seem that the Zaporozhian Cossacks knew how to defend their rights. The Senate, informed of the case, asked the hetman to consider it.<sup>516</sup> Whatever its outcome may have been (it is unknown), it proves that the Serbs showed less understanding of the importance of neighborly commercial relations than did the Zaporozhians.

Nor did the Serbian landlords make any positive contribution to the economy of the region. Some of them, such as Khorvat and his relatives, Serezlyi, Karachun, Bulatsel', Ivanov, Konstantinov, Mikhailovich, Šterić, Šević, Preradović and others acquired large estates. But they practiced large-scale farming and their main wealth lay in herds of sheep and horses, "difficult to find" in the steppe. Another important source of the landlord's revenue was the distilling of vodka and its sale in taverns. Many officers, starting with Khorvat himself, owned inns.<sup>517</sup> The revenue from inns was such an important item in the officers' economic activity, that in his "Notes" on the establishment of the New Russia province, written in 1764, Panin proposed that staff and company officers should be indemnified for the abolishing of these revenues by a monthly payment of ten and five rubles

<sup>515</sup> N. N. Ternovski, "K istorii zaporozhskogo kraja" [On the history of the Zaporozhzhya region], *Vestnik Yekaterinoslavskogo zemstva* [Courier of the Yekaterinoslav Zemstvo], Yekaterinoslav 1904, pp. 78-9.

<sup>516</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 137.

<sup>517</sup> *PSZ*, No. 11685, October 16, 1764; *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*. file 50, No. 1121. Popov, ed., "Izvestiye...", *op. cit.*, p. 450.

respectively.<sup>518</sup> On the whole, the introduction of large estates brought nothing new, except an increase in the exploitation of the local inhabitants. Thus, the foreign colonies made no contribution to the region economically, since, in an overwhelming majority of cases encountered, the people lived off the labor of others.

Various facts, which characterized the personalities of people whom the Russian government had so unreservedly trusted and provided with abundant sums and extensive privileges to the detriment of the local population, were pointed out previously. What were the characteristics of the mass of Serbs, Macedonians, Bulgarians, Moldavians and other foreigners gathering from various states in the fertile lands of the Ukraine? These people were brilliantly characterized by one of the participants in the colonization, S. S. Pišćević. At first glance, his description may seem exaggerated and prompted by his personal hostility towards Khorvat. But it shall be seen later that this characterization is fully confirmed by a series of testimonies coming from other sources. With uncommon sincerity and objectivity, Pišćević described his participation in the adventitious affair of the "Bishop" Petrovich. On that occasion, he went abroad to recruit Montenegrins, but instead returned with a party of *betyary*, i. e., vagabonds, to Nova Serbiya. Among them were unfrocked monks and priests, who had shaved their beards and "attached swords to their belts" with the "Bishop's" blessings. In Pišćević's own words: "This group was made up of thieves with not a penny to their names and heavy drunkards; nowhere else could a worse rabble have been found. Among them were armed thieves of the forest. Whatever they managed to snatch from night quarters, inns, or while passing through a locality, was theirs." True enough, Pišćević could have resorted to severe measures against them, but he abstained from doing so, since he feared that they might run away and thus create "great difficulties" for him.<sup>519</sup>

It becomes apparent from a later part of *Memoirs* that Piš-

<sup>518</sup> Odessk. ist. Muzei, *Rukop. Zbirka "Odessk. Ob-va,"* 11-30-64, p. 127.

<sup>519</sup> Popov, ed., "Izvestije...," *op.cit.*, pp. 261-62.

ćević's party was not the only one to display such low moral qualities. Soldiers of the newly-formed Macedonian and Bulgarian regiments were no better than Petrovich's and Piščević's "Montenegrins." "All of them were rebellious, dissipated, drunken. Quarrels and fights between them and the inhabitants were an everyday occurrence. It was a motley crowd which had moved from one state to another, entering and leaving service several times, and finally arrived in Russia," such was Piščević's characterization of the Bulgarian regiment.<sup>520</sup> The Macedonian regiment was no better; its members deserted to Poland in groups, taking state property, such as horses and ammunition, with them.<sup>521</sup> Piščević's testimony is fully confirmed by other materials bearing on the Serbs' stay in Kiev, while they waited for lands to be allotted to them in the southern Ukraine. On all levels, authorities were flooded with complaints against outrageous disturbances, riots, fights, knaveries, and offenses inflicted by the Serbs upon local inhabitants, in whose quarters they were billeted.<sup>522</sup> They behaved as conquerors toward peaceful townsmen, and were convinced, not without reason, of their impunity. In vain did the Kievan city council (*Magistrat*) complain against "offenses and exasperations, unbearable for the council and townsmen," and the "ruin, malice, and utter abuse" suffered by the population.<sup>523</sup> On their way from Kiev to their destination, the Serbs indulged in the same kind of excesses. They required a larger number of wagons than they were entitled to, refused to pay transportation, were not satisfied with quarters put at their disposal and requisitioned additional ones, and behaved "dishonestly" towards their hosts. Hetman K. Rozumov's'kyi passed the complaints received from the population on to the College of Foreign Affairs, but they were pigeonholed there. True enough, a special commission was appointed to consider the complaints, but no one wished to undertake this work,

<sup>520</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 416.

<sup>521</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 418.

<sup>522</sup> Andriyevski, *Istoricheskiye materialy izulechennye iz arkhivov Kiyevskogo gubernskogo pravleniya*, V, 127-28.

<sup>523</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 134-40; VIII, 1-35; X, 31-2.

the correct reasoning behind this unwillingness being, as Rozumov's'kyi wrote, "an investigation might bring even more harm."<sup>524</sup>

Once settled in Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya, the Serbs continued to exploit the defenseless population. The cattle and provisions were taken away and people were forced "by merciless beating" to perform personal services without compensation.<sup>525</sup> In 1762 Hetman Rozumov's'kyi reported to Catherine II on all the misdeeds committed by the soldiers of the Macedonian and Bulgarian regiments, which were being formed on the territory of the Vlasivka and Manzheliivka *sotni*, and requested that they be made to leave *Het'manshchyna*.<sup>526</sup>

The commanding officers of the foreign regiments were even worse than the rank and file, since they had a certain amount of power at their disposal and could count on immunity. The complaints against various abuses perpetrated in Nova Serbiya corps contain vivid characterizations of the officers. Lieutenant, later Captain, Karachun, whom Gldenstdt was to praise as an exemplary landlord, may be cited here as an example. Olishevski, whose Velahory company Karachun had appropriated, wrote in 1761 that Karachun beat people so fiercely that they fled abroad.<sup>527</sup> The Trebins'kyi brothers, ensign and sergeant, were notorious in the whole of Nova Serbiya and struck peaceful inhabitants with terror. They pillaged, killed, carried off daughters and wives, participated in *haydamak* incursions, harbored *haydamaky*, shared their spoils, etc.<sup>528</sup> Many other inhabitants of Nova Serbiya were in similar collusion with the *haydamaky*, even the clergy was not except in this respect. In 1755 Khorvat banished archimandrite Milutinovich from Nova Serbiya for "suspected dealings" with the *haydamaky*. Some time later, he

<sup>524</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 14.

<sup>525</sup> *Fond novoserbsk. korpusa*, file XI, No. 119.

<sup>526</sup> *Rukopisna zbirka Istorychnoho tovarystva Nestora Litopysystya* [Manuscript collection of the Historical Society of Nestor the Chronicler], without number.

<sup>527</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 84.

<sup>528</sup> Andriyevski, *Istoricheshkiye materialy...*, X, 76, 95; Yastrebov, "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yel.," pp. 571-73.

accused archimandrite Sophronius Dobrashevich and the monks of his monastery on the Chuta of harboring *haydamaky* in the forest and hiding their weapons.<sup>529</sup> As for Khorvat himself, he was accused of collusion with the *haydamaky* Tabanets' and Savrans'kyi. Khorvat's guilt was established during the interrogation, but the affair was hushed up by his protectors.<sup>530</sup> Other exploits of Khorvat have been mentioned in passing. He had a crowd of soldiers shot for clamoring for the pay due them, he beat his officers, treated them like servants, accepted bribes, etc. Other leaders of the colonization, Šević and Preradović, were not better. Pišćević devotes many savoury pages to them.

When one reads about all the violence, cruelty and deceit perpetrated by foreigners enjoying the full confidence of the government, when one realizes that the latter so inconsiderately sacrificed the interests of the local inhabitants to people who did not provide the region with reliable protection or even build average rural economy there, one cannot help but rejoice that this region was never fully manned by these people.

A. S. Pišćević, S. S. Pišćević's son, praises his countrymen and notes the fact that they gave a large number of commanders to Russia. "Therefore," he wrote, "the Hussars' glory remains immortal in the Russian army."<sup>531</sup>

The Ukrainian nation had a different concept of this "glory." In folk songs and folk tales the image of the Serb is synonymous with that of a robber, a knave, a rake, a good-for-nothing, unwilling to work, expecting only pleasures from life, bent upon leading a prosperous, carousing, and drunken existence<sup>532</sup> A song, recorded by V. N. Yastrebov, depicts a Serb in this way. It speaks of a handsome fellow boasting about his amorous successes, who owns no home, no cattle, and does not want to

<sup>529</sup> Arseni, "Arkhimandrit Sofroni Dobroshevich," *op. cit.*, X, 1884, 281, 287.

<sup>530</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 411, 556 and XII, 414; Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov...*, pp. 149-50.

<sup>531</sup> N. Popov, "Voyennye poseleniya serbov", *op. cit.*, p. 612; A. Pishchevich, "Primechaniya na Novorossiiskii krai," *op. cit.*, VIII, 119.

<sup>532</sup> V. Hnatyuk, "Znosyny Ukraintsiv iz Serbamy," *op. cit.*, p. 388.

work.<sup>533</sup> The echo of this concept as preserved in the *vertep* drama (a special puppet show that took place around Christmas time) is even more interesting. A "Hussarine" or "Serbine" is represented there among other nations; first, he curses in an incomprehensible jargon and then sings the following couplet:

"Mine is the field, mine the water, mine the marsh,  
Mine the gold—all is mine."<sup>534</sup>

Of course it would be unfair to consider all the foreigners as vagabonds indulging in violence. No doubt there were exceptions. But the overwhelming majority met the description given above.

It should not be forgotten that Ukrainian and Russian colonization continued along with that of the privileged foreigners. The status of the Ukrainians in Nova Serbiya, Slavyanoserbiya, and the Slobids'kyi regiment area has been discussed. Some figures will suffice here. It appears from Table 5 (see p. above) that there were 1,815 men in all the regiments of Nova Serbiya in 1762.<sup>535</sup> Table 2 shows a total figure of 2,847 men for the same year.<sup>536</sup> The difference in these data is not astonishing, considering the unreliability of eighteenth century statistics and the unwillingness of the authorities to report the true number of inhabitants. On the whole, a round figure of 2,000 men, not counting their families, may be assumed as fairly correct. About the same time, according to A. A. Skal'kovski's data, there were 1,262 men in the šević and Preradović regiments in Slavyanoserbiya.<sup>537</sup> Therefore we may assume that about 3,200 foreign colonists of different nationalities lived in Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya.

As has been stated above, 864 orderlies, craftsmen, and men of the Ukrainian people, lived in Nova Serbiya at the same

<sup>533</sup> V. Yastrebov, "Pesnya o Serbe" (A Song about the Serbian), *Kiyevskaya starina*, X, 1884, 757-58.

<sup>534</sup> Gr. Galagan, "Malorossiiski vertep" [Little Russian Puppet Show], *Kiyevskaya starina*, IV, 1882, 17.

<sup>535</sup> *Fond novorossiiskoi gub. kantsel.*, file 59, No. 1416.

<sup>536</sup> *Fond nov. gub. kantsel.*, file 47, No. 965.

<sup>537</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 65.

time. Their number amounted to 1,942 people with their families. We leave out the "newly-conscripted Serbs" who were absorbed by the mass of the foreigners (see Table 4).

In the neighboring Slobids'kyi regiment there lived 6,215 men in 1762. If we add the male Ukrainian population of Nova Serbiya, the figure of 6,879 men is obtained, not counting their families; in other words, three times as much as the figure for the foreign population in Nova Serbiya and twice as much as the number of foreigners in Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya taken together.

These figures, although inaccurate, show the approximate ratio of the foreign to the Ukrainian and Russian populations in the Southern Ukraine. They demonstrate that a powerful mass of Ukrainian colonists settled along with the numerically weaker group of privileged foreigners. These people, relying upon their strength alone, courageously set out to conquer the broad steppes of the Southern Ukraine, often in defiance of the orders issued by the Russian government. Furthermore, figures show that even the nominal strength of the Novoserbiyan Pandurs and Hussars was lower than that of the regular and irregular units of the Russian army, which protected them.

No wonder, then, that the foreign colonization did not play any noteworthy role in the history of the region and that the descendants of the "recruited nations" dissolved into the mass of the Ukrainian population. This is also the reason why V. Yastrebov, who knew the local conditions in Southern Ukraine well, having worked on its history and ethnography for over half a century, passed this judgment on the foreign colonization of Nova Serbiya: "What did the military settlements accomplish to protect the frontiers? . . . What was the positive contribution of those Serbs, Montenegrins and others to the social order of New Russia? And where are the traces of the ethnographical peculiarities of the Serbs to be found among the population of "Southern Russia"? All were absorbed by the Russian [i. e., *Ukrainian*, N. P-V.] population . . . One might ask whether the



Slavic and, in general, foreign colonization of New Russia was not a simple misunderstanding."<sup>538</sup>

Another late nineteenth century scholar, A. A. Andriyevski, expresses an even more severe opinion on foreign colonization. "There is no doubt," he writes, "that this was one of the most unsuccessful ventures of the government. The 'little brothers' admitted at that time and given the ranks of colonels and general's were nothing but clever adventurers or, better said, vagabonds, who disturbed the peace of the region, filled it with a multinational and criminal rabble, acquired undeserved honours and riches, and uselessly squandered huge amounts of government funds."<sup>539</sup>

Of course the failure of the undertaking is accounted for not only by the personal qualities of the settlers and their leaders but also by the manner in which it was conducted. Huge sums were assigned to Nova Serbiya. At the time of its founding, 109,053 rubles, 94 kopecks were paid out to recruit people abroad. In addition, 124,957 rubles, 94 kopecks and 254,590 rubles were assigned yearly for the maintenance of the regiments in peace and war, respectively.

Over and above these sums awarded by the government, indirect losses suffered by the state should be taken into account. The charter granted to Khorvat authorized Nova Serbiya to trade duty-free with foreign countries.<sup>540</sup> Khorvat and his officers made broad use of this right. They brought all kinds of things from abroad, such as clothing, ammunition and wines, under the pretext that these goods were cheaper and better in Austria.<sup>541</sup> As early as 1758 the Senate protested against this interpretation of the right to free trade and ordered that "armaments" be bought from the Tula factory.<sup>542</sup> In 1761, replying to the report of the College of Foreign Affairs, the Senate instructed

<sup>538</sup> Yastrebov, review of "Izvestiye o pokhozhdanii S. S. Pishchevicha," in *Kiyevskaya starina*, X, 1884, 327-28.

<sup>539</sup> Andriyevski, "Serby v Kiyev," *op. cit.*, XII, 605.

<sup>540</sup> PSZ, No. 9924, February 11, 1752; Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 36, 37.

<sup>541</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, X, 422.

<sup>542</sup> PSZ, No. 11363, November 28, 1761.

Khorvat to dispatch his people to Austria as infrequently as possible, and to purchase only such products there as were not manufactured in Russia. The right to duty-free trade with foreign countries was abolished in 1762. Custom houses were established along the Polish and Turkish frontier and Nova Serbiya included into the tariff system of the Russian Empire.<sup>543</sup>

During the period of Nova Serbiya's and Slavyanoserbiya's existence, all the revenues from these areas were consumed by local needs. In addition, these regions were subsidized by the government, which indicated the sources from which Nova Serbiya's and Slavyanoserbiya's deficit was to be covered. In 1759, for instance, the Senate decreed that 50,000 rubles "owed" by the Voronezh Provincial Chancery were to be transferred to Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya. In 1761, 44,648 rubles were paid out from the same source.<sup>544</sup>

Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya did not fulfill the hopes of the government. They did not provide reliable protection against the enemy, and they failed as foreign colonies. At no time of their existence did they contribute to the creation of economically strong settlements. They only swallowed up huge governmental funds without any visible results. For all that, their existence left some traces; their importance must be sought on a different plane. When the Russian government pushed the frontiers of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya further south, it was seizing, *de facto* and *de jure*, a territory which up to then had been contested by the Zaporozhians, the Ukrainian regiments, and even Poland. These disputes were discussed earlier. Simultaneously, when the government established the vanguard of the foreign colonies on the territory of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands," it introduced a new and alarming element into its relations with Zaporizhzhya, and element which was to lead to the destruction of the Sich in 1775. From this point of view, one attentive and thoughtful scholar, O. O. Rusov, was quite right

<sup>543</sup> PSZ, No. 11686, October 16, 1762.

<sup>544</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelisav.*, No. 28.

when he wrote that the turning point in the attitude of the Russian government towards the Zaporozhian Cossacks was reached with the creation of the Serbian colonies. This attitude grew more and more complicated, till it resulted in the Sich's destruction.<sup>545</sup>

<sup>545</sup> Rusov in *Materialy dlya otsenki zemel'...*, III, 121.



## PART TWO

### SETTLEMENT OF THE PROVINCE OF NEW RUSSIA

#### I. THE TERRITORY OF THE PROVINCE OF NEW RUSSIA

A "reform" of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya was carried out in 1764. The autonomy of their administration was abolished and the internal structure modified. This reform was not an isolated action, prompted by abuses uncovered during the investigation of the region. The changes in Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya were closely connected with the general policy of the Russian government towards the Ukraine and with its attempts to create a uniform political and social order in all parts of the Empire. The liquidation of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya was only a particular instance within the framework of this policy of cancelling local privileges. A short time after the reform of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya, the office of hetman was abolished in the Ukraine and the Little Russian College again created.<sup>1</sup> Count P. Rumyantsev was appointed president of the College and began to rule in Little Russia as its "commander in chief." In her "Admonition" to Prince A. A. Vyazemski, Catherine II wrote: "To call them (i. e., Livonia, Finland, and the Ukraine) foreign countries and to treat them as such is more than a mistake, it may be safely called stupidity."<sup>2</sup> One of the main tasks of the Russian government in the sixties of the eighteenth century was to remove this "stupidity." Within a few months the office of the hetman, Nova Serbiya, Slavyanoserbiya, and the Slobids'ki regiments were abolished and Russian provinces (*gubernii*) were established in their place.<sup>3</sup> Only Zaporizhzhya preserved its autonomy and "Free

<sup>1</sup> PSZ, No. 12277, November 10, 1764.

<sup>2</sup> *Chteniya...*, 1858, Book I, p. 104.

<sup>3</sup> PSZ, Nos. 12293, December 16, 1764, 12342, February 28, 1765, 12396, May 26, 1765, 12099, March 12, 1764; *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, XVI, 136; Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 202-203.

Lands" for some time, but this was only a temporary respite. Ten years later, Zaporizhzhya was no more.

The reform of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya was speeded up by an inspection of the region and the investigation of Khorvat's activities. Terrible abuses, extortion and arbitrary deeds of Khorvat and other representatives of authority were revealed. The task of carrying out a reform in Nova Serbiya was entrusted by the Senate to a committee composed of senators, the Counts Nikita and Peter Panin, the Governor General of Kiev, I. F. Glebov, and Lieutenant General A. P. Mel'gunov. Another commission, made up of Senator Count N. Panin, the chief of ordinance, General Villebois (Vil'buva), the Vice President of the Military College, Count Z. G. Chernishev, and Lieutenant General A. P. Mel'gunov, was to introduce reforms in Slavyanoserbiya. The committee found in its inspection of Nova Serbiya that it had cost the state too much, 700,000 rubles, and that this expense was not justified by the advantage derived by the state from Nova Serbiya's organization. Nor was there any reason to believe that the situation would improve in the future. Therefore the commission proposed that Nova Serbiya be transformed into an ordinary province, whose territory should be increased by the inclusion of the triangle between the Inhul and the Orel rivers, hitherto a part of the Zaporozhian "Free Land." This province, so ran the commission's proposal, should be named after Empress Catherine. Except for the last proposal, Catherine accepted all the points and decreed that the province should be called New Russia.<sup>4</sup>

At about the same time, the Military College reported to "Her Imperial Majesty" that it saw many disadvantages in the fact that the population of Slavyanoserbiya would retain its previous status under the College's jurisdiction. Therefore the College asked that Slavyanoserbiya be reorganized on the model of Nova Serbiya. As a sequel to this report, the Senate's decree of May 8, 1764 instructed A. P. Mel'gunov to examine the status of Slavyanoserbiya and take it "under his command."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronologicheskoye obozreniye*, I, 62-64.

<sup>5</sup> *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, XVI, 136.

The report of the commission appointed to investigate Slavyanoserbiya resulted in its liquidation on July 11, 1764. The commission had found that the state of affairs in Slavyanoserbiya was no better than in Nova Serbiya and that there was no reason to assume that Šević's and Preradović's regiments were able to protect the frontiers. Slavyanoserbiya was included into the Catherine district (*katerinskaya provintsiya*) of the New Russia province.<sup>6</sup>

Thus began a new period in the history of the region. Instead of foreign military colonies with their special administrative, social, and economic order, a Russian province, however different it may have been from the usual pattern, was established on Zaporozhian territory. The years between 1764 and 1775, in other words the period between the liquidation of Serbian settlements and the ruin of the Zaporozhian Sich, are among the least known in the already neglected history of the Southern Ukraine. And yet, this period is rather interesting. The influence of the Russian government was increasing in these years; the colonization of the region and the importance of the Russian nobility and merchants also was increasing.

The territory of the New Russia province comprised Nova Serbiya, the Slobids'kyi regiment and Slavyanoserbiya. But it was not limited to these areas which lay at a considerable distance from each other. The question of their unification immediately presented itself. The "Ukrainian Line" had already become superfluous, since the settlements had overtaken it, so that it no longer provided protection against the steppe. Moreover, it had been built in localities lacking in wood and a water supply, circumstances which made it of little use for the defense of the region. Therefore, the commission concluded that the "Ukrainian Line," as well as the localities lying behind it, should be put under the jurisdiction of the New Russia province.

All these territories belonged to the Ukrainian regiments, the Poltava and the Myrhorod. Their population was about

<sup>6</sup> PSZ, No. 12180, June 11 1764; 12211, July 22, 1764.

forty thousand, including more than twenty thousand *vyborni* Cossacks and *pidpomishnyky*.<sup>7</sup>

The transfer of these lands to the jurisdiction of the New Russia province occurred under the same circumstances as did the creation of Nova Serbiya over ten years earlier. Neither the hetman nor the colonels were informed of the measure. A. P. Mel'gunov, the newly appointed commander in chief of the province, addressed the administrative organs of the *sotni* directly and instructed them to request the Cossacks to join the Lancer regiments or forfeit their lands. In this way, Mel'gunov seized thirty *sotni* of the Poltava, Myrhorod, Lubny, and Pereyaslav regiments.<sup>8</sup> The incorporation of these *sotni* into the New Russia province alarmed their population and revealed the deep rift in the class structure.<sup>9</sup>

This incorporation had a voluntary appearance. Mel'gunov and his collaborators in the affair, e. g., Colonel Alymov, the cavalry Captain Synehub and others, collected signatures of those willing to pass under the jurisdiction of the New Russia province and join the Lancer regiments. The nobility was promised officers' ranks immediately, which would make them members of the Russian nobility, and *pidpomishnyky* and *pospolyti* were to be given land grants upon joining the Lancer regiments. On the other hand, the Cossacks, who already possessed property, took a negative attitude towards the reform and joined the Lancers only so as not to give up their landed property. Also the upper layer of the nobility, which owned large estates, did not favor the reform, since these large landowners were afraid of losing their peasants. For instance, there is the case of Quartermaster General Kochubey, from whose estates at Lychkova and Pysarivka two hundred household heads joined the Lancers.<sup>10</sup> Also other large landowners,

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 12180, June 11, 1764.

<sup>8</sup> D. P. Miller, "Pikineriya" (Lancers), *Kievskaya starina*, 67, 1899, 302.

<sup>9</sup> K. H. Huslysty, *Z istoriyi klasovoyi borot'by v Stepoviyi Ukrayini* [From the History of the Class Struggle in the Steppe Ukraine], Kharkiv, 1933, pp. 22-25.

<sup>10</sup> *PSZ*, No. 12236, September 6, 1764.



such as von Stoffeln, Runovs'kyi, Bytyahovs'kyi and others, suffered losses in manpower.

The hetman was assailed with complaints from people affected by the reform and reports from the colonels. He submitted a report to the Senate, pointing out that the regiment's population, once the *sotni* had been transferred to the New Russia province, was unable to fulfill its obligations and pay taxes. Moreover, the hetman wrote, the change was causing great damage to the landowners.<sup>11</sup> True enough, there were exceptions. Certain *sotni*, such as those of Kremenchuk, Vlasivka, and Keleberda, voluntarily asked to be included into the New Russia province.<sup>12</sup> So did the landowners of the little town of Kyshenka, two brothers, the Princes Baratov, and the landowners of the little town of Perevolochna, Colonels Myloradovych and Bytyahovs'kyi. But these were isolated instances.

At that time, the hetman could no longer intervene, since the office of the hetman had been abolished in 1764. In the same year it was determined which *sotni* of those initially singled out by Mel'gunov were to be included in the New Russia province and which were to retain their previous status.<sup>13</sup> As a rule all lands lying within forty versts of the "Ukrainian Line" were included.<sup>14</sup> The decree of 1765 classified the landowners' status. All persons possessing land on the basis of decrees or deeds anterior to the introduction of the "military militia order" of 1736, or having acquired it after that date by Senate or Imperial decree, were to be confirmed in their ownership and placed under the jurisdiction of the New Russia province. Those, however, who had acquired land after 1736 by deeds or charters other than Senate

<sup>11</sup> *Fond novorossiiskoi gub. kantsel.*, file 6, No. 1456.

<sup>12</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XV, 149, 158.

<sup>13</sup> The following *sotni* were incorporated: Nekhvoroshcha, Mayachka, Tsarychanka, Kytayhorod, Orel', Perevolochna, Kyshenka, Sokilka, Kobylaky, Bilyky, Stari and Novi Sanzhary, Keleberda, Kremenchuk, and Vlasivka.

<sup>14</sup> *PSZ*, No. 12236, September 6, 1764, 12339, February 26, 1765; *Fond novorossiiskoi gub. kantsel.*, file 61, No. 1456, sheet 328; Miller, "Pikineriya", *op. cit.*, pp. 321-22.

or Imperial decrees, were to lose their rights over their peasants, who were to be enrolled into the Lancer regiments. The New Russia Provincial Chancery was to determine the number of landowners, the character of their titles, as well as the number of peasants living on their estates. This affair progressed very slowly and it was not until 1767 that the Catherine district chancery was able to report that thirty-seven landowners held their estates without proper decrees.<sup>15</sup>

For a long time the frontier between *Het'manshchyna* and the New Russia province remained indefinite, and the boundaries of the forty verst belt were not traced. The New Russia Provincial Chancery decided to fix this frontier definitely in 1766. A commission made up, among others, of the representative of the New Russia province, First Major Sed'yakin, and the representative of the Little Russia College, Colonel Horlenko, was appointed for that purpose. The commission met with resistance from the landowners. Since their actual possessions were larger than those to which they were entitled, the landowners refused to admit surveyors on their estates and halted the commission's work. Bowing to the landlords' attitude, the Provincial Chancery did not insist energetically upon the surveying.<sup>16</sup>

In 1770 F. M. Voyerikov, the commander in chief of the New Russia province, ordered a new map of the contested territories to be drawn.<sup>17</sup> The affair dragged again; it was not until 1781 that a large territory was taken away from the Myrhorod and the Poltava regiments and incorporated into the New Russia province.<sup>18</sup>

In 1765 the territory of the New Russia province was increased at the expense of the Bakhmut county of the Voronezh province. Before that date, the town of Bakhmut was in New Russia, but the rest of the county belonged to the Voronezh

<sup>15</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 61, No. 1458.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, file 65, No. 1460, sheets 1, 16-17.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, file 62, No. 1458; file 65, No. 1480, sheet 140.

<sup>18</sup> F. Nikolaichik, *Gorod Kremenchug* [The City of Kremenchug], St. Petersburg, 1891, p. 60.

province.<sup>19</sup> Azov and Taganrog were annexed to the Empire in 1769, and Kerch and Yenikale, in 1773.<sup>20</sup> The Azov province was created from a part of the New Russia province in 1774.

The New Russia province was divided into two districts. Yelizavetgrad district was situated on the right bank of the Dnepr and comprised the former territories of Nova Serbiya, the Slobids'kyi regiment, and the triangle between the Inhul and Orel. On the left bank the Catherine district coincided with the former lands of Slavyanoserbiya and the "Ukrainian Line."<sup>21</sup> The Bakhmut county was not a part of the Catherine district, but constituted a separate unit of the New Russia province.<sup>22</sup>

There were two Hussar regiments in the Yelizavetgrad district, the Black and the Yellow, and one Lancer regiment, the Yelizavetgrad. The Black Hussar Regiment was stationed on the territory of the Khorvat Hussar; the Yellow, on the territory of the Pandur.<sup>23</sup> The southern part of the province was occupied by the settlements of the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment. The regiment's headquarters was first in Yelizavetgrad; later it was moved to the settlement of Petrykivka, which lay nearer the center of the regiment area.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>19</sup> PSZ, No. 12376, April 13, 1765.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 13351, September 9, 1769; Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozreniye*, I, 81, 82, 89.

<sup>21</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 60, No. 1441.

<sup>22</sup> PSZ, No. 12376, April 13, 1765.

<sup>23</sup> The Black Hussar Regiment consisted of the following sixteen companies: Novomyrhorod (regimental headquarters), Pichka, Petroostriv, Nadlak, Kal'nybolot, Semlek, Novoarkhangel'sk, Martonosh, Panchiv, Kanyzh, Sentiv, Vukovar, Fedvar, Subotytsya, Tsybuliv, Mashoryn. The Yellow Hussar Regiment was subdivided into the same number of companies: Kryukiv (regimental headquarters), Kryliv, Taburyr, Kamyanka, Zymun, Pavlysh, Chonhrad, Nesterivka (Vershach), Hlyns'k, Sambor, Dmytrivka, Bacha, Varazhdyn, Hlahovats, Yaniv, Sholmosh. See Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozreniye*, I, 72.

<sup>24</sup> The regiment consisted of the following eighteen companies: Murzynka, Vershynokamyanka, Verblyzhka, Zelena, Omel'nyk, Domotkan', Borodaivka, Boyans'ke, Kam'yanka, Myshuryr Rih, Hruz'ka, Vyska, Pletenyi Tashlyk, Drys'ka, Novoarkhangel'sk, Dobryanka, Orlyanka, Popel'nyasta. See, Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozreniye*, I, 72-73, and *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 86, No. 2092.

At a later date a fourth regiment, the Moldavian Hussar, was settled in the Yelizavetgrad district. A part of the territory originally destined for the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment, namely, the settlements of Vyska, Dobryanka, Hruz'ka and Pletenyi Tashlyk, was destined for this regiment.<sup>25</sup> The Moldavian regiment, stationed on the very frontier of the New Russia government and the Zaporozhian "Free Lands," cut into Zaporozhian possessions and this led to constant disputes between the Cossacks and the Moldavian settlers.

Towards the end of the First Turkish War (1769-1774), the Bug (Boh) Cossack regiment, formed from Moldavians and Bulgars, was established even farther south, since its settlements were along both banks of the Southern Bug. The settlements of Mykhaylivka (Yelizavethradivka), Krasnosillya, Kucherivka, Lozovatka, Laheri, Novofahataïvka, Serbyna, Ruda, Ukhivka, and Vodyana were colonized in 1770.<sup>26</sup>

The regiments did not make up the whole territory of the Yelizavetgrad district. The region around the St. Elizabeth fortress, formed separate units which were called state counties (*gosudarstvennyye okruga*).

In the Catherine district the land was divided among various regiments. At first, it was decided in 1764 to form one Hussar regiment out of the two formerly commanded by šević and Preradović, to add three Lancer regiments to it, and to move the Moldavian Hussar regiment from Kiev.<sup>27</sup> The Hussar regiment, named the Bakhmut Hussar, was quartered in the Bakhmut area. The Lancer regiments, the Luhan', and the Donets, were settled along these two rivers, and the Dnepr Lancers, along the Dnepr, from the sources of the Samara to

<sup>25</sup> Like most of the other regiments, it had sixteen companies: The Catherine Retrenchment (headquarters), the Pavlovs'k fortress, Vyska, Pishchanka, Chorny Tashlyk, Ternivka, Inhul's'ka, Dobryanka, Synyushyn Brid, Lyp'yanka, Pletenyi Tashlyk, Lysa Hora, Tyshkivka, Sukhyi Tashlyk, Hruz'ka, Vil'shanka. See, Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozreniye*, I, 122 and A. Shmidt, *Materialy dlya geograf. i statist. opisaniya Ross. im. Khersonsk. gub.*, I, 43.

<sup>26</sup> *Materialy dlya otsenki zemel'...*, III, 123.

<sup>27</sup> Ternovski, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-7.

the former boundary of Nova Serbiya. The Samara Hussar regiment, now called the Moldavian Hussar, occupied the area south of the Dnepr regiment stretching to the Samara's mouth.<sup>28</sup>

Projecting deep into the south and surrounded by hostile neighbors, the New Russia province retained its semi-military character during its entire existence. It tried to improve its fortifications; new ones were constructed and the old ones repaired, especially during the war with the Porte (1769-1774). This activity was of special importance for the Catherine district, since the "Ukrainian Line" had long since fallen into decay. Moreover, settlements had moved far beyond this line. The construction of a new "Dnepr Line," which was to protect the New Russia province from Tatar incursions, was begun in 1770. This line started with the Petrovs'ka fortress on the Azov Sea and, after crossing the Berda and Kins'ki Vody rivers, reached the Dnepr. A chain of fortresses was to be built along the "Dnepr Line," namely, Petrovs'ka, Kyrlyivs'ka, Nykytyns'ka, Oleksandrivs'ka, Zakhariivs'ka, Hryhoriivs'ka, Oleksivs'ka and Dniprovs'ka. The task of its construction was entrusted to General Dedenyev under the overall supervision of General Shcherbinin, and from 1772 under Major General Chertkov.<sup>29</sup> This plan was not carried out, only the Oleksan-

<sup>28</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozreniye*, I, 66. The Luhan regiment had ten companies: On the Krynka River at the mouth of the Bulavyns'kyi Kolodyaz'; Vsebytok; a settlement and a village on the upper Kryvyi Torets'; on the Bychka River (a settlement and a village); on the Kazennyi Torets' at the mouth of the Mohyl'chani Bayraky; at the mouth of the Kazennyi Torets'; on the Mayachka River near its mouth; on the Sukhyi Torets', above the Byk; on the Sukhyi Torets', below Barvinkova Stinka; on the Sukhyi Torets' at the mouth of the Cherkas'ka Balka; *ibid.*, p. 71. The Dnepr regiment had ten companies in 1773: Stari Sanzhary, Novi Sanzhary, Velyts'ka, Kobyl'yaky, Sokil'ka, Kyshenka, Perevolochna, Keleberda, Kremenchuk, Vlasivka. See, Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozreniye*, I, 91. There were also ten companies in the Samara regiment in 1773: Praskoviys'ka, Petrovs'ka, Belevs'ka, Kozlovs'ka, Ryaz'ka, Nekhvoroshcha, Mayachka, Tsarychanka, Pyatyhirs'ka, Orlyts'ka.

<sup>29</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronol. obozr.*, I, 84-85; *Arkhiv gosudarstvennogo soveta* [Archives of the Council of State], St. Petersburg, 1869, I, Part I (Historical section), 340-41.

drivs'ka fortress was built, and the Kurylivs'ka, partly constructed.<sup>30</sup> The other fortresses were in the blue-print stage. Only barracks and "engineers' quarters" were built on the sites of the Nykytyns'ka and Zakhariivs'ka fortresses. As for the Hryhoriivs'ka and Oleksivs'ka fortresses, "no construction was begun there," according to a registrar of localities of the Azov province, drawn up in 1782.<sup>31</sup>

The "Dnepr Line" was constructed on the territory of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands," but the government disregarded the Zaporozhians' rights to these lands. In 1770 Catherine wrote in her decree to Shcherbinin, the Governor General of the Slobids'ka province and chief supervisor of the construction of the "Dnepr Line," that the purpose of this line was to protect the Slobids'ka province and Little Russia and that it would not be long before the lands between the Dnepr, the Kalmius, Bakhmut, and "the old Line" would be colonized, especially if strong protection were provided.<sup>32</sup>

Indeed, the territory protected by the "Dnepr Line" was settled at a rapid pace and covered with redoubts, retrenchments, and storehouses. The Zaporozhians had every reason to think that they had lost a part of their "Free Lands," "slept them away," to use the picturesque expression of Pylyp L'vivs'kyi's letter, in which he notified Camp Chief Kalnyshivs'kyi of the construction of redoubts and entrenchments.<sup>33</sup>

The St. Elizabeth fortress, now more often called Yelizavetgrad, was foremost among the more important localities of the province of New Russia. From the very beginning, the government's administrative center, the commander's chancery and

<sup>30</sup> The Aleksandrovskaya fortress was built by the following engineers: Lieutenant Colonel Panin, Captain Nakoval'ski, Captain Bakhtin, Lieutenant Putimtsev, Ensign Musin-Pushkin, under the general supervision of Colonel Bibikov of the Corps of Engineers. *Arkhiv gosud. soveta*, I, Part 1, 341; Ya. Novitski, *Istoriya goroda Aleksandrovsk* [History of the City of Aleksandrovsk], pp. 5, 27.

<sup>31</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronol. obozr.*, I, 85; and *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, 130; Novitski, *op. cit.*, p. 35; *Zapiski odessk. obshch. istorii i drevnostei*, III, 289.

<sup>32</sup> Novitski, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5

the customs office were established there. The suburbs which surrounded the fortress continued to increase. The Old Believers community was granted various privileges and had a wealthy church of its own; they accounted for the majority of of Yelizavetgrad merchants. The Greek community, too, grew in strength and numbers. According to the description left by Güldenstädt, the business center of Yelizavetgrad, Podil, had 600 houses, laid out in rows to form regular streets, a town hall, a market place and many shops by 1774. Podil's inhabitants were mainly merchants and craftsmen. In other parts of Yelizavetgrad there were more than 300 houses, belonging partly to merchants and burgesses and partly to officers. Güldenstädt found about 1,200 burgesses in the fortress in addition to merchants and military men. Nevertheless, the appearance of the town was very shabby, and the buildings within the fortress, such as the district chancery, the school, the prison, the guard-house, were slowly decaying. Houses in the suburbs and in the fortress proper were made of bad wood and their roofs were either thatched or shingled. Willows grew here and there, but orchards were rare. A few truck gardens stretched along the river. There was no bridge over the Inhul, since the river flooded a vast area every spring. But in summer its waters dried up so that it could be waded with ease. On the whole, the water supply of Yelizavetgrad was a serious problem. The fortress had deep wells, but the suburbs had only small wells with stale and hardly drinkable water.<sup>34</sup>

In 1765 the administrative center passed from Yelizavetgrad to Kremenchuk, which had been incorporated into the province of New Russia together with the *sotni* of the Myrhorod regiment. Kremenchuk remained the provincial capital to the end of the period under discussion. The customs office and the only government pharmacy were also moved to Kremenchuk. All these transfers favored the increase of the city's population and the arrival of Russian merchants. The first sugar factory of the region was established in the vicinity

<sup>34</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelys.*, Nos. 23. 29; Güldenstädt, *op. cit.*, II, 175-7.

of Kremenchuk.<sup>35</sup> Kryukiv, a little town on the right bank of Dnepr, opposite Kremenchuk, also continued to grow. Some time later, it was incorporated into Kremenchuk and became its suburb. The streets in Kryukiv were broad and straight. Some state orchards lay within the town, while others were a few miles from it.<sup>36</sup>

Novomyrhorod lost its importance as the administrative center and ceased to be Khorvat's residence, but it remained the chief locality of the Black Hussar Regiment. The fortifications were in decay, the moats dried up, the walls crumbled, Khorvat's buildings half-ruined, but the suburb continued to develop. According to Güldenstädt, it had 600 burgess and merchant houses in 1774. Trade was carried on in shops on the market place and during fairs. There were many orchards and vineyards in Novomyrhorod and its vicinity, as well as distilleries, tanneries and brick yards.<sup>37</sup>

Novoarkhangel's'k retained its former importance as a commercial center. At the time of Güldenstädt's visit, it had about 300 burgess and merchant houses. In 1774 approximately forty merchants and twenty-three craftsmen lived there, the latter organized into a guild.<sup>38</sup>

Bakhmut, whose founding dates back to the seventeenth century, was the most densely populated locality on the left bank of the New Russia province. Fortifications to protect its salt-works were built in 1703. Bakhmut grew to be a fairly important commercial center, mainly owing to its salt trade. In 1764 the town was included in the New Russia province and became the administrative center of Bakhmut county.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Nikolaichik, *op. cit.*

<sup>36</sup> Güldenstädt, *op. cit.*, II, 125-7.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 151-2.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 160-1.

<sup>39</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 70.



## II. ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROVINCE OF NEW RUSSIA

During its existence, the administration of the province of New Russia retained its semi-military character. In this respect, its organization was similar to that of Nova Serbiya and Slavyanoserbiya.

The first decree on the organization of the New Russia province stipulated that it was to be headed by a commander in chief, assisted by an aide, or governor, and a chancery, divided into military and civil departments. The military department was responsible to the Military College, and the civil, to the corresponding departments of the Senate. Both the commander in chief and his aide were permanently on the staff of the Ukrainian division. Every three years they were to be replaced by new officials; in case of war, only one of them was to remain in the province.<sup>40</sup>

All authority, covering diplomatic relations, administration, justice, and command of the troops, was concentrated in the hands of the commander in chief. The holders of this office were: Lieutenant General Aleksei Petrovich Mel'gunov, Major General Jacob von Brandt (Fon Brandt) (September 1765-December 1766), Lieutenant General Michael Ivanovich Leon-t'yev (January-July 1767), General en chef Feodor Matveyevich Voyeikov (July 1767-1774) and from 1774, Grigori Aleksandrovich Potemkin.<sup>41</sup>

The commander in chief's aide had the functions of a civil governor. This post was held by Major General Alexander Stepanovich Isakov. In addition, "a trustworthy person from among the Serbs," as the decree formulated it, was also appointed. The purpose of this temporary position was to protect the interests of the foreign population during the formative period of the new province. Nothing is known of this

<sup>40</sup> PSZ, No. 12099, March 22, 1764; *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, XVI, 127-9; Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 202-3.

<sup>41</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronol. obozr.*, pp. 64, 70, 75; *Senatskii arkhiv*, XV, 455, 652, 669.

“person’s” functions. The post was occupied by Brigadier Zorich, the uncle of Catherine’s favorite.

The Commandant of Kremenchuk, Brigadier Vasili Alekseyevich Chertkov, acquired great influence in the course of time. Since Isakov’s many duties prevented him from attending to all his affairs, Voyerikov ordered Chertkov “to take control of all written business, carry it on diligently, and to be in constant correspondence with the Commandant of the St. Elizabeth fortress, artillery Major Gering, concerning all happenings in that area, and, if possible, submit a daily report on these things and on the enemies’ movements.”<sup>42</sup> In this manner Chertkov was given powers which served to place him over Isakov.

The New Russia Provincial Chancery, at first located in the St. Elizabeth fortress and, from 1765, in Kremenchuk, was the chief organ of local administration. Its members were the civil governor, the commander of the fortress, staff officers of local regiments, and the commander of the Old Believer settlements. The latter at the same time acted as the commissioner for border affairs. In 1766, the staff of the chancery consisted of the following persons: Brigadier V. A. Chertkov, commander of the St. Elizabeth fortress; First Major Plovetski of the Yellow Hussar Regiment, Captain Dubrovski of the same regiment, and Second Major Bulatsel’ of the Black Hussar Regiment. The membership of the chancery changed every year. For instance, First Major Olishevski replaced Dubrovski in 1767; in 1768 First Major Borovski of the Yellow Regiment and in 1769 a Captain Furman of the same regiment were among the chancery members.<sup>43</sup>

The documents provide only incomplete data on the staff of the chancery. In addition to its members, it had a secretary and architects, first a certain Burckhardt (Burgardt), then

<sup>42</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantseľ.*, file 76, No. 1666, sheet 411.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, file 62, No. 1458, sheet 74, No. 1477; *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, Nos. 143, 182.

Neyelov (1772-1775).<sup>44</sup> There were also physicians of different ranks: a staff or "provincial" physician (Sharov) and those of lower ranks, like Aksenius, and others.<sup>45</sup> A unit sent to survey land, which issued maps to the landowners, prevented illegal seizure of lands, etc., was under the chancery's jurisdiction.<sup>46</sup>

The powers of the Provincial Chancery were broad and indefinite. One of its chief functions consisted in supervising the colonization of the region and allotting land. On the whole, it was to supervise all aspects of the life of the region, such as founding and administering settlements, breeding farms, factories, etc. Still, it must be said that the chancery's functions were not defined in advance, but developed as the province developed. For instance, land was first allotted by various institutions, such as the district and commander's chanceries and the "generals' corps"; but, from the late sixties on, the Provincial Chancery concentrated in its offices the distribution of land as well as the control over the distribution. It appears from the chancery's orders issued in accordance with Voyeikov's decision as well as from several requests of the chancery that its powers continued to increase considerably. It alone was empowered to distribute land, to see to it that the contracts by which land was allotted were executed, to select unpopulated areas, etc. Purchase deeds could be signed only in the chancery. It prevented landlords from taking fugitive peasants into their service, etc. Until 1774 merchants were under the jurisdiction of regimental chanceries; thereafter, they came under the provincial chancery.<sup>47</sup>

The staff of the chancery was small and its salaries pitifully

<sup>44</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 62, No. 1458, sheet 377; and file 73, No. 1621; *Arkhiiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, Nos. 143, 172.

<sup>45</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 85, No. 2028; file 95, No. 2414.

<sup>46</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 9, No. 2253, 2264.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, file 76, No. 2067; *Odesski istoricheski muzei, Zbirka Odesskogo Obshestva istorii i drevnostei* [Collection of the Society of History and Antiquities of Odessa], II, 30-64, No. 115.

low. There were not enough people to fill clerical positions. The complaint filed by the governmental chancery with Commander in Chief Voyeikov is interesting in this respect. In spite of the fact, it was argued in the complaint, that the New Russia province differed from other provinces in that it had been put under military regulation, the chancery did not know whether it was authorized to appoint non-commissioned officers, corporals, and rank-and-file soldiers. As for appointing men from the common people (*raznochintsy*) as officials, candidates could not be found, since the remuneration offered was very low. The only solution would be to appoint two or three boys to one position and to free their fathers from the Lancers' tax. Voyeikov forbade granting this kind of exemption, whereupon the chancery replied that it could not guarantee that it would find the required number of literate people.<sup>48</sup>

The lack of qualified officials was felt on all levels. Higher posts in the New Russia province were held by members of Khorvat's administration. Colonel Odobash, the former commander of the Slobids'kyi regiment, was now in command of the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment; Colonels Chorba and Plovetski, who had commanded the Pandur regiment, were assigned the Black and Yellow Hussar regiments respectively. Captains Olishevski, Borovski, Bulatsel' and other officers of Serbian regiments held various lower positions.

When the New Russia province was divided into two districts in 1775, each of them was administered by a voivode and a district chancery. Bakhmut country had a voivode of its own. Second Major Nicholas Chernikov, a former adjutant of Khorvat's and a member of the latter's "suite," the word comes from Pišćević, was appointed voivode of the Yelizavetgrad district.<sup>49</sup> Second Major Aleksei Alymov was voivode of the Catherine district, and Privy Councilor Fliverk, of

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 30-64, sheet 115-119.

<sup>49</sup> *PSZ*, No. 12367, March 26, 1765; Popov, ed., "Izvestiye o pokhozhenii...", *Chteniya*, p. 376.

Bakhmut country. Fliverk was soon replaced by Colonel Ivan Shabel'ski.<sup>50</sup>

The staff of the district chancery was fairly large. It consisted of two secretaries, each of lieutenant's rank, two general clerks, one clerk, one interpreter, two apprentices, and one land surveyor. Moreover, an executioner was permanently attached to the chancery.<sup>51</sup> The chancery staff of the Yelizavetgrad district was smaller than that of the Catherine district. For instance, the Yelizavetgrad chancery had only one secretary, while the Catherine chancery had two. The Provincial Chancery's request for the appointment of a second secretary in the Yelizavetgrad district chancery, which was more burdened with business, was declined by Voyeikov, who refused to change the civil service list or to permit the appointment of an extra official. But he allowed the hiring of a pensioned official who would be given maintenance.<sup>52</sup>

The personnel of the Yelizavetgrad district chancery was as follows: voivode, Second Major Chernikov; secretary, Lieutenant Vishnyakov (to 1772) and Lieutenant Berezhans'ki (from 1772).<sup>53</sup> The members of the Catherine district chancery were Colonel Alymov, First Major Neyelov, Captain Yulinets' and Lieutenant Pimenov.<sup>54</sup> Reikhel (succeeded by Danilevs'ki after Reikhel's death in 1773) was the district physician.<sup>55</sup> The chief forester (*forshtmeister*) who administered all forests of the province was also responsible to the chancery. This office was held by Second Major Maksimov.<sup>56</sup>

Since the regiments did not include all the population, the regimental administration was paralleled by other units which

<sup>50</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, Nos. 169, 172; *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 60, No. 1441; Ternovski, *op. cit.*, No. 25.

<sup>51</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 62, No. 1458, sheets 30-316, p. 9.

<sup>52</sup> *Zbirka Odesskogo Obshchestva...*, 11-30-64, sheets 115-119.

<sup>53</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 62, No. 1450 and file 76, No. 1606; *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, Nos. 151, 169, 174.

<sup>54</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 65, No. 1480.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, file 91, No. 2253.

<sup>56</sup> *Arkhiv. krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 174.

were under the immediate jurisdiction of the district chancery. Among them were the Old Believers' settlements with a commander of their own.<sup>57</sup>

The functions of the regimental administrative units were indefinite and subject to change. This is shown by the transfer of the merchants from the jurisdiction of regimental chanceries to that of the Provincial Chancery. It is possible that the vagueness of the authority of regimental units explains the fact that the higher administrative organs occasionally preferred to approach the company administration directly, bypassing the regimental units. Thus, in 1765 Chertkov issued a direct order to the companies forbidding their inhabitants to wear bast shoes;<sup>58</sup> the Yelizavetgrad district chancery enjoined the company administrative boards to see that newcomers brought no pestilence into the province's territory.<sup>59</sup>

The St. Elizabeth fortress commander and his chancery held a position apart. As contrasted with the previous period, so many people held this office consecutively that none of them had the time to distinguish himself in any respect.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.* Nos. 2, 172. First Major Lazar Srezliyi was the first commander of the Black Hussar Regiment, he was succeeded by Captain Kiyashka in 1770 (*Arkhiv. krip. sv. Yelisav.*, No. 128). The commander of the Yellow Hussar Regiment was Colonel Vasili Lupul-Zverev (*ibid.*, No. 126); the commander of the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment was Colonel Nicholas Odobash (*ibid.*, No. 126; *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 87, No. 207; *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, XVI, 84-86). The commanding personnel of the regiments stationed on the left bank of the province of New Russia is but incompletely known. The Dnepr Lancer regiment was commanded by Colonel Alymov, the Luhan' Lancers by Shabel'ski. <sup>58</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 174.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 174.

<sup>60</sup> Since Skal'kovski's list of the commanders of the fortress is not complete, I shall give a complete list: Colonel A. A. Irman, 1763-1764 (*Arkhiv, krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 107); Colonel G. G. Frizel', acting commander, 1764-1765 (*ibid.*, No. 121); Brigadier V. Chertkov, 1765 (*ibid.*, Nos. 125, 128); Colonel I. I. Glebov, 1765-1768 (Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 97); Colonel Kh. G. Korf in 1768 and Major Gering 1769, succeeded temporarily after his death by First Major Khalkydon'ski, up to June 1769; Lieutenant Colonel K. I. Gessi, June 1769-1772 (*Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 174); Lieutenant Colonel I. Duving, 1772-1774 (*ibid.*, No. 174).

The commander's organ was the garrison chancery, or as it was later called, the commander's chancery. Gradually all affairs concerning the garrison of the fortress came under its jurisdiction. As long as the fortress harbored all four chanceries, the provincial, the district, the commander's, the Yelizvetgrad regiment's, their duties and rights were not clearly distinguished, nor their mutual relations precisely defined. In its correspondence with the commander's chancery, the district chancery used a special form of address. It did not issue an "order" (as it did with reference to subordinate institutions) or write a "report" (as to a superior) but only a "notification" (*izvestiye*).<sup>61</sup> In spite of this tone, which was intended to signify equality, the commander's chancery was subordinated to the district chancery in several respects. For instance, in 1772 the district chancery "notified" the commander's chancery that "it has been decided that the current papers and decrees of this chancery are to be submitted for Duving's approval and signature.... Henceforward, Duving is to sign the papers of this chancery, whereof the commander's chancery is notified."<sup>62</sup> At the same time, the commander's chancery addressed "proposals" to the district chancery: "In 1772, we propose to dispatch an engineer with a group of workers to rebuild the Catherine entrenchment."<sup>63</sup>

The functions of the commander's chancery were rather numerous. Usually, all military units, including the outposts, were under its order. Governor Isakov instructed the commandant, Chertkov, in 1765 not to approach either the provincial or district chancery on these matters, since the problems of the outposts required immediate decisions. All this was very logical; by nature, military affairs should have been under the jurisdiction of a military commander. However, the same document also contains the following remark: "Although the newly colonized settlements have been put under your

<sup>61</sup> *Arkhiv. krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 174.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 174.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 125.

jurisdiction by the recruiting agent... nevertheless do kindly take the trouble of transferring them to the jurisdiction of the Yelizavetgrad district chancery." Instead of a purposeful division of functions, this meant a purely personal approach in administrative matters, an attitude which was rather widespread.

### III. PLAN OF SETTLEMENT OF THE PROVINCE OF NEW RUSSIA

The principal hope in creating the province of New Russia was to colonize this region and strengthen the Russian influence there. Once possession of this territory was secured, Russian landlords moved in and established themselves. The colonization of the New Russia province, closely connected with general state policies, was a striking example of the practical application of the abstract theories of the mid-eighteenth century.

The second half of the eighteenth century in Russia was characterized by "populationist" (*populyatsionist*) ideas which expressed tendencies of a state order built upon serfdom. The abstract ideals of Western European economists and the real needs of the state converged in the desire to increase the population. In the field of theory, the classical, although outdated works of Western European economists like Justi, Bielfeld, Sonnenfels and others, were assiduously translated into Russian. In their works, Russian scholars like Lomonosov and Zabelin, and scholarly institutions like the Academy of Sciences and the Free Economic Society (*Vol'noye ekonomicheskoye obshchestvo*), popularized the idea of the importance of increasing the state's population.<sup>64</sup> These ideas were reflect-

<sup>64</sup> M. M. Shpilevski, "Politika narodonaseleniya v tsarstvovaniye imperatritsy Yekateriny II" [Population policy in the reign of Empress Catherine II], *Zapiski novorossiiskogo universiteta* [Notes of the University of New Russia], 1871, VI, A, 9-23, 30-32; N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Manifest 1775 r. v svitli tohochasanykh idei" [The Manifesto of 1775 in the Light of Contemporary Ideas], *Zapysky istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu Ukrains'koi Akademii nauk* [Notes of the Historico-philological Section of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences], 1927, Vol. XII. *passim*.



ed in the *Nakaz* and in many decrees;<sup>65</sup> the contracting of marriages was facilitated, the rights of single people were curbed, etc.<sup>66</sup> The more subjects a state has, the wealthier and stronger it is, since it may field a larger army to the enemy; the more serfs there are, the wealthier is the landlord, such was the simplified form of the "populationist" theories which found their way into Russia, a state whose social order was based on serfdom.

The natural increase in population was not considered sufficient, since time was required for the growth of the new generation. Therefore, the government paid special attention to foreign colonization. In addition, measures were taken to secure the return of those Russian subjects who had fled abroad; foreigners were lured by various exemptions. The government of Catherine II took a different attitude towards foreign colonists than did the government of Elizabeth. It removed all restrictions concerning their religious beliefs. In the fifties foreign colonization had been a spontaneous movement; foreigners arrived on their own initiative, and the Russian government's role was limited to allotting territories to them and granting exemptions and privileges. Now the government attempted to take the movement of foreigners to Russia into its own hands. The manifesto of December 4, 1762 invited all foreigners to migrate to Russia and promised them "the Monarchs favor." The manifesto was translated into different European languages and sent to Russian minister residents at various European courts.<sup>67</sup> Shortly thereafter, two more acts were promulgated which served as a basis for the whole foreign colonization: the decree on the establishment of a "Chancery for the Protection of Foreign Colonists" and a manifesto on rights granted to foreign settlers. The very organization of the chancery, put on the same level with

<sup>65</sup> *Sbornik IRIO.*, XII, 85, 86.

<sup>66</sup> *PSZ*, No. 12433, July 14, 1765; 12378, April 18, 1765; 12801, December 15, 1766.

<sup>67</sup> *PSZ*, Nos. 12433, July 14, 1765; 12378, April 18, 1765; 12801, December 14, 1766; 11720, December 4, 1762; V. A. Bil'basov, *Istoriya Yekateriny II* [History of Catherine II], St. Petersburg 1885, Part II, Appendix V, p. 522.

the Colleges and headed by G. G. Orlov, the powerful favorite of Catherine, shows that the government considered foreign colonization a matter of high importance. A large number of "recruiters" were sent abroad to encourage those willing to immigrate to Russia. Two hundred thousand rubles were assigned by the government for provisioning the colonies and for the construction of factories and mills. As a result of the commission's activity, 117 new colonies were founded in Russia.<sup>68</sup>

In spite of this intensive colonizing activity, we possess only one contemporary document which can give us an idea of the extent to which the theoretical postulates of the decrees were actually carried out. It should be kept in mind that the 117 colonies mentioned above were scattered through various provinces, e. g., Chernihiv, Saratov, St. Petersburg, Voronezh, Livonia, and that they had a private character, i. e., they did not affect the structure of the provinces. This one document is the "Plan for the Colonization of the Province of New Russia," (*Plan o poselenii v Novorossiiskoi gubernii*) which was confirmed by the Senate on April 2, 1764. This document reflects contemporary views on the colonization and shows how theoretical considerations were carried out in practice. Its interest and importance is in its attempt to encompass all aspects of the region's life and to subordinate this life, as it were, to the needs of the colonization, beginning with the allotment of land and ending with the problems of education. The value of this document to the scholar is greater when one realizes that this is a unique piece of evidence having no parallel in contemporary literature.<sup>69</sup> Nor should it be forgotten that this "Plan" was not only a colonization project, but also a set of laws, which remained in effect in the New Russia province up to the eighties of the eighteenth century. It is striking that the authors of the "Plan"

<sup>68</sup> PSZ, Nos. 11879, July 22, 1763; 11880, August 7, 1763; 12283, November 17, 1764.

<sup>69</sup> PSZ, No. 12099, March 22, 1764; *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, XVI; Solov'yev, *op. cit.*, VI, 38 (reprinted in abridged version).

envisaged the region as a wilderness with neither population, laws nor customs; a virgin territory to be settled and, therefore, offering to the lawmaker an opportunity to outline new laws and plan a new life.

Although the "Plan" has been published several times, it is interesting that it has not attracted the proper attention of either Russian or Ukrainian historians. The document is divided into eight chapters: "On Prerogatives," "On the Allotment of Land and the Principles Governing Its Use," "On Recruiting," "On Revenues," "On Forests," "On Commerce, Merchants, Factories, and Mills," "On Boundaries," and "On Schools."

The first point of the first chapter was that every inhabitant of the province, whatever his place of origin and whenever his time of arrival, possessed all the rights of the "native Russian subject"; the second, that each military settler would be allotted a certain amount of land as an hereditary possession in perpetuity; the third, that no settler or "burgess" would be held to perform military service against his will, and no one would be forbidden to trade salt or brandy, and, pending a new decree, it was permissible to import food and wares from abroad and to export them from Russia without payment of custom duty. The rights granted to the inhabitants of the New Russia province by this point were greater than those of the native Russian subjects and comparable to those formerly enjoyed by the colonists of Nova Serbiya. The fourth point of the first chapter made unrestricted enrollment into Hussar and Lancer regiments free for any nationality. All recruits would receive a bonus of thirty rubles. The fifth point was concerned with Russian subjects, who, or the parents of whom, had returned from abroad prior to the term set in the decrees, and with Zaporozhians enrolled in Hussar or Lancer regiments. All these persons would receive a bonus of twelve rubles; as may be seen, there was an inequity between the rights of the Russian subjects and the foreigners to the subsidy. The sixth point promised a

payment of six rubles to settlers, foreign or native. In point seven a "travel and provision" allowance of three rubles was granted to recruiting agents for each foreign settler capable of performing military service; for any other foreign settler, this allowance would be two rubles only; for a Russian subject or a Pole, whether intending to serve in the army or to settle in the region, the allowance would amount to one and a half rubles. Point eight stated that colonists granted land in the province would have to people it by recruiting settlers from abroad at their own expense. Finally, in point nine, all servicemen were released from military duty for one year in order to be able to attend to their households; therefore they would get no pay, only a subsidy "for necessities (of establishment)."

This chapter contains several interesting features. The government invited not only foreigners, but also Russian subjects who had fled abroad, although it valued their service lower, granting them a smaller subsidy "for the necessities" and paying the agents less for recruiting them. Moreover—and this is a feature which distinguishes the organization of New Russia from Nova Serbiya—the government was also interested in peopling non-military settlements, although the "price" for civilians was lower than for military colonists. The first chapter was a kind of preface and the ideas laid down in it were developed in the subsequent chapters.

The second chapter, "On the Allotment of Land and the Principles Governing Its Use," was the most important of all. Here is the summary of its points:

1. The New Russia colony would be subdivided into seventy counties (*okrugi*), fifty-two of which were destined for servicemen; two, for townspeople; sixteen, for the rest of the population, such as Old Believers, foreigners, and immigrants from abroad unwilling to found separate settlements. In all, an area of 1,421,000 *desyatiny* (a *desyatina* equals 2.7 acres), 19,000 for each county was set aside for the colony. The length of the duty-free period depended on the quality of the soil and extended from six to sixteen years, subject to

confirmation by the commander in chief. Every county consisted of shares, which in turn consisted of twenty-four plots; thus, the county would have 700 plots. In thirty-two counties the area of plot would be twenty-six *desyatiny*, while in the remaining thirty-eight counties, which have no forests, it would be thirty *desyatiny*. Every plot was to remain indivisible and of the same size; this would enable its holder to perform military service and pay taxes. This was the pivotal point of the "Plan." It set a norm for future ownership of land and remained in force not only during the existence of the New Russia province, but also during a later period, especially with respect to the area of a peasant's homestead. The insistence on the unchanging size of every plot is most interesting. By this measure, the authors of the "Plan" intended to secure the complete fulfillment of military and fiscal duties by the population. At the same time it provided for the welfare of the owner, who was free from the menace of the plot's being divided among several heirs. Such an arrangement, common in the military feudal system, was a novelty for the Russian Empire.

The same principle, with one slight change, was introduced into the law of March 19, 1764 concerning the allotment of land to foreigners. This change consisted in speaking not of the settler's rights of possession, but of his use of the plot which belonged to the community. Yet, in both cases the plot was to be indivisible and to be passed on to one of the settler's sons, chosen by the father.<sup>70</sup>

2. Servicemen were responsible to company commanders, who shall refer to the regiment in military and to the New Russia Provincial Chancery in civilian matters.

3. The whole territory was to be divided into three parts: (a) the holdings of state settlers, paying a land, not a poll, tax; (b) the holdings of landowners, taxable; (c) the holdings of military colonists, non-taxable. The principle of land tax was also intro-

<sup>70</sup> PSZ, No. 12095, March 19, 1764; A. D. Klauss, *Nashi kolonii*, pp. 18-19.

duced into the law of March 19, 1764, establishing taxes in areas held by foreigners.

4. Whoever agrees to bring immigrants from abroad at his own expense will be given as much land as he wants, under the following conditions: (a) The land will be given to him in unconditional ownership, if there is at least one peasant homestead in every plot (i.e., in an area of twenty-six or thirty *desyatiny*). If the land is not settled within three years and no adequate reason can be given for failure to do so, the land will be apportioned to another. (b) After the expiration of the duty-free period the owner was bound to pay for the land, but half as much as state settlers, in view of the fact that he has brought immigrants at his own expense. (c) No one shall be (permanently) given more than forty-eight plots. Should some person settle a larger area, the excess would be sold.

5. No one would be allowed to buy more than forty-eight plots. Should someone inherit or otherwise come into possession of an area exceeding forty-eight plots, he shall sell the excess. If there is no buyer the treasury would make a reasonable estimate and take over the land and the peasants settled upon it. If the treasury finds no buyer, the peasants will be enrolled among state settlers.

6. Possession of land shall be limited to people serving in the Nova Serbiya corps or residing within the boundaries of the province. If a landowner accepts a position at another place and is forced to leave, he shall sell the land to local inhabitants. If the land is not sold within two years, it shall be taken over by the treasury at a reasonable price. This point regulates the character and size of the landowners' possessions.

The problem was approached from two different angles. On the one hand, the "Plan" was primarily concerned with the interests of the local population. It does not even contain any restrictions of a class character with respect to the purchase of land, which could be acquired by anyone financially capable of bringing in immigrants. On the other hand, the "Plan" puts a limit to the size of each landlord's estate. It can not exceed 1,440 *desyatiny* in districts where the household unit is thirty *desyatiny*, or 1,248 *desyatiny*, where this unit is twenty-six

*desyatiny*. This was a novelty when compared with the usual practice of land allotment prevailing in other parts of the Russian Empire. The limit set by the author of the "Plan" may be explained only by his desire to bring about as quick a colonization of the region as possible, since peopling of very large areas was scarcely to be expected. It is also noteworthy that the landlord's residence is required to be in the province. This was an entirely new stipulation, which had at its root the desire to create a permanent group of landowners and to strengthen Russian influence in the region.

Points five and six concern the conditions of military service. Point five said that every military plot shall provide one soldier. If, after his death, no other member of the family is fit for military service, the plot is transferred to the category of "settlers' plots." To fill the gap, one of the settlers shall voluntarily join the ranks. If there are no adults among the deceased soldier's heirs, who might be enrolled as settlers, the children of such a soldier shall be sent to an orphanage and his land given to another settler or a member of a large family desirous of starting a life of his own. The buildings shall be sold and the money given to the heirs when they come of age. The commander in chief shall see to it that the contingent of soldiers be always kept in full and that the plots remain of prescribed size. It is stipulated in point six that soldiers are exempt from the land tax; this exemption shall apply to their widows and children for a term of ten years. After the expiration of that term the land will pass to the heir, in part or in full, according to the latter's rank; if, however, the heir will not perform military service, it shall be considered as landowners' land for taxation purposes. The same principle shall apply to taxes levied from "excess" land. For example, a colonel's son, who is only an ensign, is entitled to a smaller area than his father; he therefore will pay taxes for the remaining area of the estate as if he was a landowner.

In point one of the third chapter, "On Recruiting," every

person performing military service is granted the right to retire on account of illness, or to provide as his substitute either his son or some other able-bodied member of his household. Point two specifies that a soldier and an able-bodied settler may exchange their plots. In this case, the ex-soldier will pay all taxes due from the settler's plot. In point three not only the commander in chief but also each family is exhorted to see that the service is performed impeccably and that in case of a soldier's desertion he be immediately replaced by a relative. If a soldier has few relatives, several families should unite, so as to provide at least two working men per household in a Lancer regiment and at least three in a Hussar regiment. The above points regulate the military service and the possession of land by soldiers. The connection established between the family and military service is especially interesting, namely, the family is held responsible for the performance of its member. Also of interest is the idea of increasing the size of the family by adding outsiders to it and creating a steady reserve of working men in every household. Here a replica of the institution of *familiyaty*, introduced in Nova Serbiya, is seen. What is striking is the abundance of all sorts of guaranties by the "Plan" to secure satisfactory performance of military service. The conclusion automatically arises that without these guaranties service would not be adequately performed.

Point six is concerned with the problem of recruitment. Whoever brings a certain number of immigrants from abroad will be given a commission. If he is fit for service, he shall be assigned to a regiment. If he is not, he shall only have the commission, be given the ranks' land and paid the "recruitment sum." A major's rank is bestowed for recruiting 300 people; a captain's for 100 people; a lieutenant's, for 80 people; an ensign's, for 60 people. If the immigrants are not soldiers, but settlers, their number must be twice as high for the recruiter to be entitled to a corresponding commission. In comparison with the practices prevailing in Nova Serbiya, where a captain's rank was given for 100 immigrants, a lieu-



tenant's, for 75, and an ensign's, for 50 immigrants, the requirements of the "Plan" were much higher. It may be explained partly by a desire to keep unreliable elements from entering the officers corps. As shall be seen later, this point was substantially modified.

The fourth chapter, "On Revenues," was concerned with the maintenance of the province's regiments from revenues of the region after the expiration of the duty-free period. These revenues consisted of: (1) a land tax levied on state and landowner's peasants; (2) an inn tax; (3) the sale of cattle at fairs; (4) the exporting cattle abroad; (5) the export of salt and fish from the Crimea and the Sich to Poland; (6) the import of brandy from Poland; (7) turnover-tax levied on merchants; (8) taxes levied on artisans, according to their craft; (9) revenues from mills. All these sums, with the exception of the land tax, were to be collected immediately and were destined for the construction of schools, hospitals, orphanages, shops, etc.

The subject of the fifth chapter was the forests. Point one prohibits anyone from building houses of wood; they were to be either mud-huts (*mazanki*) or made of brick, or, in exceptional cases, useless dry wood covered with clay. The roofs shall be either of tile or covered with earth. Plots shall be surrounded by earthen enclosures. Point two prohibits the building of distilleries (an exception is made for those who will plant and care for trees). Point three states that whoever plants and encloses a wood becomes its owner, and four, that whoever finds deposits of peat, building stone, or clay shall be given the land containing them provided he takes it upon himself to sell these products at reasonable prices. The local administration went even a step further to protect the forests. Chertkov forbade the making of bast-shoes in order to preserve the trees and imposed a fine of five kopecks for every tree stripped or felled.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>71</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 174; "Presledovaniye laptei kolonizatorami Novorossii" [Opposition to Bast Shoes by the Colonizers of New Russia], *Kiyevskaya starina*, XV, 1886, 754-56.

Chapter six deals with commerce and factories. Here is the summary of its points: (1) Commerce with Turkey and the Crimea should be increased. (2) All foreigners and Russian subjects coming from Poland and other localities shall be eligible as merchants and members of guilds in the St. Elizabeth fortress, Orel, Arkhangel's'k, Novomyrhorod, Kryukiv, and Myshuryn. (3) Merchants from Russia enrolled in the merchants' list of the New Russia province shall pay the same amount of taxes they had paid in the places of their former residence. (4) Any person has the right to establish factories and breeding farms. Prospective founders will be granted sites for their enterprises. It is most desirable that factories be established which satisfy the needs of the military, such as biscuit factories, tanneries, textile mills, or military cap factories; also horse and sheep breeding farms shall be given priority. The treasury will issue loans at an interest rate of six per cent *per annum* to founders of these enterprises. (5) Whoever will establish a silk factory or a vineyard or any other enterprise rare in Russia, shall be entitled to custom-free export of his products both abroad and to Russia for a period of ten years. (6) Foreign craftsmen shall be given loans "for providing necessary things" at no interest.

The contents of this chapter are interesting in that the development of industries is subordinated to military needs. The privileges extended to business men are also interesting. Point five had been adopted from the manifesto of July 22, 1763, which established privileges for foreigners, but the borrowings of the "Plan" stop there. It is important to note that it does not say a word on the manufacturers' rights to buy serfs for their factories. Since the chief concern of the "Plan's" authors was to increase the population of the region, serfdom is not mentioned in the document even once; it would have had a detrimental effect on the region's colonization.

While the seventh chapter does not contain anything of interest in regard to the colonization of the region, the eighth

chapter, "On Schools," is of great interest. Here are its points: (1) All children must learn reading, writing, arithmetic and religion in school; if they wish, they may ask for instruction in foreign languages and other disciplines. Orphans and poor children shall be maintained at state expense; those able to pay shall cover the cost of their maintenance, but education in general shall be free. (2) Special schools shall be established for the education of girls; this will contribute to the softening of "severe and rude customs by (forming) virtuous women." From her childhood on, a woman should be taught "household and any other becoming work." (3) Asylums shall be established at state expense for orphans, cripples, and foundlings, so that "in the whole colony there may be no beggar, vagrant, or neglected innocent infant."

In its contents and terminology, this chapter is reminiscent of Catherine II's *Nakaz*, and, in its rhetorical character, it greatly differs from other chapters of the "Plan." Matter-of-fact statements are less numerous here and the overall tone is lyrical. This lyricism, however, contains some noteworthy features, e.g., the postulate of general and free education for boys and girls alike. Of course, all this remained on paper, but it is interesting to note that the problem was posed in 1764, although in the form of an utopian wish.

Such is the content of this extremely interesting document, which reflects the conditions of the period in which the New Russia province was taking form. In some of its parts, this document is closely related to other acts of the period, but its importance is far greater, since it more fully encompasses different aspects of the region's life. The "Plan," in comparison with the decree regulating the organization of Nova Serbiya, reflects the changed attitude towards the landlords' property. The decree strictly limited the landholding right for foreigners; the "Plan" granted this right to anyone who would come to live in the province. At the same time, it permitted commoners to come into the possession of landlords' estates, provided they would bring with them a sufficient number of immigrants.

The "Plan for the Colonization" had the force of law in the New Russia province for a long time. All persons asking for land allotments received them on the basis of its provisions. Nevertheless, it was subject to several changes in the course of time. One document, preserved in a nineteenth century copy in the collection of the former "Society of History and Antiquities" (*Obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei*) of Odessa, is of great importance in this respect. The copy contains detailed projects of amendments to the "Plan," submitted by the New Russia Provincial Chancery to the "former" commander in chief, *General en chef* Voyeikov in 1780.<sup>72</sup> The copy has three columns with the following headings: I. The Chancery's Report; II. Commander in Chief Voyeikov's Resolution in Response to It; III. In View of That, the Following Is To Be Carried Out. Thus, every question is presented here in its three consecutive phases: first, the Provincial Chancery raises the question as to the change of a given point of the "Plan" and justifies its report; thereupon, Voyeikov makes his decision; finally, the chancery issues instructions concerning the implementing of Voyeikov's decisions. The date given by the copy is suspect. It can not be either the date of the execution of the original document, or that of the report, or that of Voyeikov's decision, since in 1780 Voyeikov was no longer commander in chief. The chancery might have submitted its report and received Voyeikov's answer only between 1767 (when Voyeikov was appointed commander in chief) and 1773. This interpretation is borne out by a passage of Voyeikov's decision, which states that the Military College was considering the problem of assigning to regiments officers who were not members of the nobility. The College was deliberating this question in 1773. The copy contains other indirect clues to the date of the document, e. g., references that this or that measure should be carried

<sup>72</sup> Odessk. istor. muzei, *Zbirka Odessk. Obshch-va ist. i drevn.*, 11-30-34, *Sbornik razlichnykh dokumentov, otnosyashchikhsya k Yuzhnoi Rossii* [Collection of Various Documents Pertaining to South Russia], sheets 191-195.

out not later than 1774. Most probably, the document was compiled from the chancery's reports, Voyerikov's decisions and the report on their execution, in 1774, when Potemkin, appointed commander in chief, had collected different information on the province's general situation, statistics, and commerce, distribution and settlement of the land.

An analysis of the document shows that most changes were introduced into point four of the second chapter. The "Plan" stated explicitly that anyone who would bring a certain number of immigrants from abroad would be given a commission and land in accordance with the rank granted to him. The chancery inquired of Voyerikov how the land was to be allotted, since according to the law it could be given only to the nobility and staff and company officers. However, this contradicted the provisions of the "Plan." Voyerikov answered that land for settlements should be given only to members of the nobility, members of the corps of generals, staff and company officers, and to non-commissioned officers. All others should be given land only for breeding farms, orchards, and vineyards, on the condition that they would not settle on the land. All commoners who had received land for settlements were to sell it to those entitled to hold it, or else to return it to the treasury for equitable compensation. The New Russia Provincial Chancery made use of this decision in order to extend its rights. It monopolized the allotment of land and required all persons applying for such allotments to present certificates, issued by provincial chanceries, that they were entitled to hold land. Voyerikov's decision introduced a class-conscious corrective into the liberal tenor of the "Plan."

The changes in point four did not stop there. Voyerikov decided that landlords should not be deprived of estates which they did not settle within three years, but rather should be required to pay taxes for this period. If they should fail to colonize their estates within the subsequent three years, then the land should be given to others. In effect, the term

granted to the landlords was extended from three to six years.

Also the "Plan" prohibited the allotment of areas larger than forty-eight *desyatiny* and this aroused doubt within the chancery. Some landlords, especially the officers of the Catherine district and Bakhmut county, acquired more land through inheritance, purchase, or allotment. Voyeikov took an indulgent attitude towards these landlords, authorizing them to hold their estates temporarily, pending the Senate's decision on this matter. (The landlords in question were those whose lands were included into the New Russia province after the incorporation of certain areas from other provinces.)

Certain aspects of point four provoked a number of questions from the chancery. According to the "Plan," the ranks' lands were to be given only to persons who performed effective service in the province's regiments; but by order of the "Generalitet" they were being given to retired officers as well. Voyeikov acquiesced in the latter, providing allotments to retired officers would not harm others. In the Slobids'kyi regiment, the chancery pointed out, the allotment norm for officers was higher than envisaged by the "Plan." Voyeikov decided the the former norm should be applied. The "Plan" barred non-residents of the New Russia province from holding land there. Voyeikov's decision also voided the "Plan's" provision in the case of persons who upon their departure entrusted their estates to local managers; he decided that they should retain possession of those estates. Local regiment officials, Voyeikov argued, are provided with land. Should this point of the "Plan" be strictly carried out, large areas would remain unpopulated. Of course, landlords abandoning their estates without supervision should be dispossessed. The Provincial Chancery instructed district chanceries to inform it about the owning of land by outsiders and the way in which it was administered.

Thus, the "Plan" of the colonization of the New Russia province was radically changed ten years after its confirmation

by the Senate. Points which favored intensive settling of the region and secured its particular order were changed to bring it nearer standards of the Russian nobility.

Point four of the third chapter of the "Plan," which offered a commission to anyone who would bring immigrants with him, did not correspond to these conditions. The Provincial Chancery asked Voyerikov what it should do if immigrants were brought by merchants or people paying taxes (as opposed to the nobility and the clergy). Voyerikov dared not solve this question personally and asked the Military College for instructions. The latter answered in 1773 that neither merchants nor common people should be given commissions. This point was also changed in favor of the ruling nobility.

The Provincial Chancery attempted to change the third point of this same chapter. This dealt with the number of "reserve" members in the serviceman's family; the chancery proposed that land be allotted to them at once. In this case Voyerikov sided with the "Plan" and ordered that no change be made regarding this point.

One interesting explanation proffered by Voyerikov deserves mention here. The Provincial Chancery authorized only people who would plant woods to possess distilleries. This condition created special difficulties for the landlords of the Catherine district, who had owned distilleries since time immemorial without having to plant woods. Voyerikov solved the problem in favor of the landlords; they were to be allowed to own distilleries on the condition that they had the firewood brought from neighboring provinces. Should it be disclosed that they used local wood, their distilleries were to be confiscated.

The chancery had its doubts in regard to point four, chapter six, which concerned allotment of land for sheep and horse farms. Voyerikov defined the hazy directives of the "Plan" more clearly. Land for sheep farms was to be granted at the ratio of one *desyatina* per sheep; for horse farms the ratio was to be five *desyatiny* per horse.

Such is the content of this interesting document. All the changes introduced had a pronounced class character and were aimed at liquidating the order established by the "Plan." They deprived it of its distinctive features, slowly substituted Russian for local customs, and defended the interests of the ruling noble class.

A plan for the colonization of former Slavyanoserbiya was issued simultaneously with the "Plan for the Colonization of the Province of New Russia."<sup>73</sup> The territory of Slavyanoserbiya was divided into 140 counties of 20,000 *desyatiny* each. Thirty-two districts were destined for settlers "so that there might be people from whom to receive taxes" (the expression is taken from the plan for the former Slavyanoserbiya), while the rest went to people performing military service. This plan contains little that is new. It says that "all the dispositions in all respects shall be made on the basis of the regulations concerning the New Russia province and confirmed by Her Imperial Majesty." Changes could be introduced, however, provided the authorities were notified of them. It also advised settling military companies near the boundaries and civilian settlers in the middle of the territory. Their villages were to be surrounded by earthen walls, to provide protection from enemy incursions. Twelve staff officers were to draft plans for the entire district. The whole organization of the Catherine district had a temporary character; this was pointed out in several passages of the plan, e. g., "Until regiments as well as fortresses and redoubts are founded... forests shall remain under state jurisdiction until future dispositions about the administration of the region are made." The plan states furthermore that as soon as conditions in the New Russia province become stabilized, it would be possible to increase the number of the Hussar and the Lancer regiments. In this manner strong protection for the borders would be provided; this would lead to the increase of the population, which in turn would contribute to the manning of the regi-

<sup>73</sup> Ternovski, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-7.



ments. The principal idea of this plan, the contents of which are inferior to the previously discussed "Plan," was that the Catherine district had to retain its military character and everything there should be subordinated to defense needs.

One other interesting document may be added to the plan for Slavyanoserbiya, namely, the instruction of Commander in Chief Mel'gunov to the chief of Bakhmut county, Privy Councilor Fliverk. Its most probable date is 1765, since Bakhmut county was not included into the New Russia province until September 12, 1765. On the other hand, Mel'gunov received another appointment in October of the same year. Thus the instruction could have been written by Mel'gunov only some time in September 1765.<sup>74</sup>

Its contents follow. The county chief shall see to it that a hussar's household should not suffer from neglect during the latter's absence in war. Regiments will be manned by family people only; single men will be accepted but not inscribed on the rolls. They may be included into the regular staff of the regiments if they "multiply" their families or promise to "found a family within a short time." This part of the instruction is typical and might serve as a supplement to the "Plan" of 1764. On the one hand, this requirement partly guaranteed a conscientious fulfillment of duties by unmarried soldiers; on the other hand, it fully corresponded to the tendency of restricting the rights of single persons in order to increase the population. Two laws of 1766 and 1767 respectively may be quoted in this context. The former concerned the elections for the Commission of 1767 and stipulated that representatives should be married and have children; the latter barred unmarried and childless people from being elected to public functions in state villages.<sup>75</sup>

Mel'gunov's instruction to Lieutenant Colonel Shabel'ski, commander of the Luhan' Lancer regiment, stationed near Zaporizhzhya, reflects a different attitude. The instruction ad-

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>75</sup> *PSZ*, No. 12801, December 14, 1766.

vises enrolling everybody, Ukrainians, Zaporozhians, foreigners, without restrictions and fixes the amount to be paid to recruits upon joining the regiment. Foreigners shall receive thirty rubles upon entering military service, twelve if they come as settlers. Zaporozhians are to receive twelve rubles in either case. Settlers and Lancers shall be granted freedom from taxation for a period of three years. Settlements which existed before the organization of the regiment will not be destroyed; their inhabitants are eligible to enter service in the regiment.<sup>76</sup>

#### IV. DISTRIBUTION OF LAND TO LANDLORDS AND THE SETTLING OF ESTATES

According to the "Plan" the whole area of the New Russia province, with some insignificant exceptions, was divided among the Hussar and the Lancer regiments. Regiment lands were given to military settlers and to officers. As has been already stated, each serviceman received one indivisible plot of land, amounting to thirty or twenty-six *desyatiny*. Here, the crucial point was the obligation taken by the members of the serviceman's family to provide a substitute in case of the latter's illness, death, or desertion.

Active officers and physicians received the ranks' lands according to the rank they held.<sup>77</sup> Such lands were not a peculiarity of the New Russia province, since they had existed in Slobids'ka Ukraine and *Hetmanshchyna* for a long time.<sup>78</sup> But here, this institution acquired certain distinctive features. Both in New Russia and in the two territories mentioned above, lands granted to the officer class were called "the ranks' "

<sup>76</sup> PSZ, No. 16603, December 31, 1787.

<sup>77</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 76, No. 1666, pp. 393-396.

<sup>78</sup> V. A. Barvinski, *Krest'yane Levoberezhnoi Ukrainy XVII-XVIII vv.* [Peasants of the Left Bank Ukraine in the 17th and 18th Centuries], Kharkov 1909, pp. 94-116; V. A. Myakotin, "Ocherki sotsial'noy istorii Malorossii," *Russkiye Zapiski*, 1915, January, pp. 191-192; August, pp. 166-170; November, pp. 143-156.

lands, but in the Left-Bank Ukraine the size of these grants was not exactly determined and depended on the person who received the grant and on the "favor" of the giver. It was not until 1734 that a decree of Empress Anne attempted to put a limit to the extent of these grants, but the norm remained very high, ranging from 30 to 400 households.

Essentially, these lands were temporary holdings, granted in exchange for service. Once the service was discontinued or the holder accepted another office, the land was to be returned or transferred to another person. In reality, this theory was not adhered to in the Left-Bank Ukraine. There, a continuous struggle went on for transforming these lands into ordinary hereditary estates. Quite often, they were given in perpetual possession, a circumstance which spurred other holders to seek the same treatment for themselves.<sup>79</sup>

In 1733-1737 the following sizes of the ranks' grants were established in Slobids'ka Ukraine: colonels were to receive fifteen households; *obozni*, seven; judges, six; non-commissioned officers, two. The norm for the grants was much lower here than in *Het'manshchyna*.<sup>80</sup>

In the New Russia province it was established from the outset that every rank entitled its holder to a certain amount of land. Herein lay the difference between New Russia and the Left-Bank Ukraine. The size of the ranks' allotments in the New Russia province was as follows: ensigns, lieutenants, regimental auditors, quartermasters, adjutants, commissioners, and physicians received land for four households, i. e., 104 or 120 *desyatiny*; infantry and cavalry captains, for six households, i. e., 150 or 180 *desyatiny*; second majors, for seven households, i. e., 182 or 210 *desyatiny*; first majors, for eight households, i. e., 208 or 240 *desyatiny*; lieutenant colonels, for ten households, i. e., 260 or 300 *desyatiny*; colonels, for

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 1915, I, 191-192; Barvinski, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-105; "General'ne slidstvo pro mayetnosti Lubens'koho polku" [General Investigation of the Possession of the Lubny Regiment], *Ukrayins'kyi arkhiv*, Kiev 1921, IV, 55.

<sup>80</sup> P. Golovinski, *Slobodskiye kozach'i polki*, p. 169.

sixteen households, i. e., 416 or 480 *desyatiny*; finally, priests, for two households, i. e., 52 or 60 *desyatiny*.<sup>81</sup>

Allotment norms were higher than in Slobids'ka Ukraine but still much lower than in *Het'manshchyna*. It must be pointed out that, despite the changes in the officers' lands elsewhere, their size in the New Russia province remained the same. The theory behind this arrangement was as follows: when the holder of a grant was promoted, he was to be given an additional plot; when he died or retired, his holding was to be transferred to his successor. In practice, people did not succeed in receiving the ranks' lands for several years. In such cases, the interested person looked for a convenient holding on his own initiative. This is reminiscent of bygone times, namely, the "recruitment of the ruler's servicemen" (*verstaninya gosudarevykh sluzhilykh lyudei*), including all the peculiarities of this institution.<sup>82</sup> For instance, in 1774 the physician Dankovski notified the Catherine district chancery that he had found an unoccupied plot of land between the settlements of Pikinerna, Petrovs'ka and Tsigler. He asked to be given this four-household plot as due to his rank.<sup>83</sup> Sometimes a serviceman made inquiries on his own and reported that a given holding was not occupied or that for some reason its holder had lost his right to it. In this way the control over holdings was facilitated.<sup>84</sup>

The officers were dissatisfied with the size of their allotments. In the instructions issued to their representatives to the Commission of 1767, officers of the Black and Yellow Hussar regiments complained that if they settled the workers, to which they were entitled, on the ranks' lands instead of

<sup>81</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 73 No. 1621; *Arkhiv tauricheskogo upravleniya gosudarstvennykh imushchestv* [Archives of the Administration of State Property of the Province of Tauride], fasc. IV, Nos. 50-54.

<sup>82</sup> V. Ya. Rozhdstvenski, *Sluzhiloye zemlevladieniye v Moskevskom gosudarstve XVI st.* [Service Landholdings in the Muscovite State of the 16th century], St. Petersburg 1897, p. 301.

<sup>83</sup> *Arkh. tauricheskogo upravl. gosud. imushchestv*, IV, No. 593.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 591, 592; *Sbornik IRIO*, XCIII, 20, 31.

orderlies, nothing would remain for the officers themselves. Therefore they asked that their allotments be increase to twice their present size.

But the main struggle over the ranks' lands was more concerned with making them equal with other types of landed property, than with their size. The circumstances which violated the purity of the principle of conditional ownership of these lands were many. First, there was the right to transform them into full property, once they were peopled by a fixed number of settlers. Secondly, the right of selling such lands, which was the corollary of the first. Many documents attest to sales of the ranks' lands.<sup>85</sup> This prompted an inquiry on the part of the Provincial Chancery, which asked Voyeikov what should be done when officers sold their ranks' lands to outsiders upon accepting service elsewhere, a practice which deprived newly appointed officers from lands due to them. Voyeikov's answer was rather vague; he said that lands should be sold not to outsiders but officers who replaced the outgoing holders. If the parties could not reach an argument as to the price of land and buildings, it should be equitably established by the Provincial Chancery. Should the newly appointed officer refuse to accept this price, the land was to be sold to an outsider. In such a case the officer who refused was to be content with his salary alone. Should no buyer for the land be found, it was to return to the treasury, "for equitable compensation."<sup>86</sup> In this confused manner Voyeikov attempted to solve the conflicts that arose; he defended the interests of the seller and granted him the right to dispose of land allotted him as a part of his compensation. At the same time, the seller deprived his successor of this part of his profit and forced him to buy the land, or to do without it, if the successor was not able to pay an "equitable" price. That the fixing of the "equitable price" was left to the Provincial Chancery opened the way for all sorts of abuses.

<sup>85</sup> *Arkh. tavrisheskogo upr. gosud. im.*, fasc. 14, p. 595; V, No. 405; IX, No. 1483.

<sup>86</sup> *Odessk. ist. muzei, Zbirka...*, II-30-64, pp. 95-101.

The "Plan" of 1764 had envisaged the possibility of the ranks' lands being inherited by owners' sons holding an officer's rank. Lands, however, were passed not only to sons but to daughters as well. Upon remarrying, a widow was entitled to transfer the land to her new husband under the same conditions under which it would be transmitted to her son performing service. Thus the widow of Lieutenant Sukhomlynov married Auditor Prokopovych who asked that Sukhomlynov's land be allotted to him.<sup>87</sup> A similar practice prevailed in case of daughters who married. Sisters inherited lands from their brothers.<sup>88</sup> Thus a major's wife, Arapova, inherited the officers' lands held by her brother, Captain Korbe.

The institution of the ranks' lands, therefore, was in continuous danger of being merged with the ordinary type of property. From this point of view, the instructions issued by officers to their representatives to the Commission of 1767 are of great interest. All the officers of the Black and Yellow Hussars and the Yelizavetgrad and Donets Lancer regiments asked to be granted unconditional ownership of their ranks' lands.<sup>89</sup>

In conclusion, it must be said that during the short existence of the New Russia province the officers' lands were rapidly subjected to a process of transformation from conditional into unconditional ownership. They could be sold, bequeathed, mortgaged or disposed of in any way the owner pleased.

In addition to these lands, others were allotted for settlements and breeding farms. Lands settled with the full number of households, i.e., at a ratio of one household per twenty-six or thirty *desyatiny* according to the locality, became the permanent possession of the settlers. Neither the "Plan" of 1764 nor the Senate decree of 1767 restricted any rights in this respect.<sup>90</sup> As was seen the New Russia Provincial Chancery

<sup>87</sup> *Arkhiv tavr. upr. gos. im.*, IV, No. 414.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, V, No. 759.

<sup>89</sup> *Sbornik IRIO*, XCIII, 21, 28, 31, 32.

<sup>90</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 67, No. 1511.

quickly succeeded in curbing these to the advantage of the nobility and in securing Voyerkov's approval of this measure. Commoners could be granted land only for breeding farms, orchards, vineyards, etc. All persons not belonging to the nobility were obliged either to sell their land to nobles, return it to the treasury, or change their settlements into breeding farms.

According to the "Plan," settlement grants could not exceed an area accommodating forty-eight households, i.e., amounting to 1,246 or 1,440 *desyatiny*. Usually, however, half-size grants for twenty-four households were given. Exact data on the apportioning of lands in the Yelizavetgrad district during the period 1764-1773 are available. The evidence for the Catherine district is less abundant.<sup>91</sup>

Land was granted on the condition that it would be settled. The fulfillment of this condition was strictly controlled, since all landlords were obliged to furnish information on the fluctuation of population on their estates. In 1769, the New Russia Provincial Chancery instructed the district chanceries to report on the amount of land apportioned to each landlord, the period for which it had been allotted, the number of households to be settled and those already settled, the localities from which the peasants had come, whether they came from abroad or Little Russia, the size of the unoccupied area, and the reasons for its remaining unpopulated. The Notice of 1769 was the response to this inquiry.<sup>92</sup>

Voyerkov's supplement to the "Plan" contains information on measures applied to landlords who failed to settle the estates apportioned to them within three years. Taxes were gathered from them for the whole period of land tenure, including the duty-free period. After a lapse of three more years, the lands were forfeited to the treasury. Cases of this sort happened frequently, since it was difficult to settle lands, given the conditions of the times. The "Notice on the Colo-

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, file 73, No. 1661.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, file 62, No. 1458.

nization" of the Catherine district lists the obstacles to successful colonization. One landowner, Bulgakov, wrote that he had been able to settle only seven households instead of sixteen, since a part of the colonists had moved to the Zaporozhian "Free Lands," while many others had died of the plague. Priest Ivan Kovalev's'kyi settled nine households instead of sixteen; Second Major Logachev and Captain Bukreyev settled nineteen households instead of forty-three because the rest of the settlers were scattered by brigands and those who remained, "live in fear." Colonel Machebelov and the colonel's wife, Denisova, had been unable to people their estates, for the Zaporozhians frightened off their settlers. The Provincial Chancery prolonged the term for settling estates for each of these landlords. Others, however, such as Prince Baratov and a certain Yeropkin, were dispossessed "on account of the owner's negligence."<sup>93</sup>

The situation of the right bank of New Russia was hardly better. In addition to the usual Zaporozhian incursions, raids by members of the Polish nobility proved to be a major disturbance there. The story of Lieutenant Runich is illustrative of the conditions prevailing in that area. Runich's homestead had been raided repeatedly by the nobleman Khajnowski, who commanded a band of 200 men.<sup>94</sup>

But in spite of these obstacles, colonization progressed at a rapid pace. Owing to a continuous movement of people from the Right-Bank Ukraine, the colonization movement was much greater in the Yelizavetgrad district of the New Russia province than in the Catherine district. The settlers established themselves either in state or in privately owned settlements.

Between 1764 and 1774, 288 grants were distributed in the Yelizavetgrad province for settlements, various types of breeding farms, orchards, and woods. The term "grant" means a plot of land apportioned to an individual or to a settlement. If an individual was granted several plots either in different

<sup>93</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 62, No. 1458, pp. 574-77.

<sup>94</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 174.



regiments or consecutively in the same regiment, I consider them as so many grants. The following table, compiled on the basis of several sources, contains information on lands apportioned in the Yelizavetgrad district.

It appears from Table 6 that the land was unevenly distributed among the regiments. The largest area was apportioned to the Black Hussar Regiment, namely, 73 grants amounting to 73,297 *desyatiny* or 26.8 per cent of the land granted in the district. Although 81 were granted to the Yellow Hussar Regiment, they amounted only to 59,949 *desyatiny*, or 22 per cent of the total apportioned area. State districts received 45 grants covering the area of 68,432 *desyatiny*, or 25 per cent of lands allotted. The Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment was granted 39 grants, or 36,270 *desyatiny*, or 13.3 per cent of lands allotted. The St. Elizabeth fortress county's allotment was 41 grants, or 23,450 *desyatiny*, or 8.6 per cent of lands allotted. The number of grants allotted in the whole district was 288, and the area covered by them, 273,068 *desyatiny*. It must be added that the data on distribution of grants among regiments are not exact, since the territory of the Moldavian regiment was carved out from that of the Yelizavetgrad regiment at a later date. Therefore, grants to the Moldavian regiment are listed as belonging to the Yelizavetgrad.

It is interesting to follow the data on allotments for each particular year. In the first years of the New Russia province's existence the amount of apportioned lands continued to increase. In 1764, 12 grants, amounting to 12,258 *desyatiny* or 4.5 per cent of lands allotted were granted in the whole province. In 1765 the figure went up to 18 grants, corresponding to 18,374 *desyatiny* and 6.7 per cent of lands allotted. In 1766, as much as 32 grants, occupying 26,898 *desyatiny* or 9.9 per cent of lands allotted were given. In 1767, 77 grants, i. e., 76,383 *desyatiny*, or 28 per cent of lands allotted. In these years, the region attracting landlords and peasants was quickly colonized. From 1768 on, the number of grants decreased rapidly. Only 40 grants, i. e., 31,970 *desyatiny* or 11.7 per

cent of lands allotted were given in that year and the figure continued to diminish in subsequent years. It is probable that this was due to the war with Turkey and the Crimea which had started about that time and had a considerable impact

TABLE 6

## LANDS APPORTIONED IN THE

		1764		1765		1766		1767	
		Grants	Desyatiny	Grants	Desyatiny	Grants	Desyatiny	Grants	Desyatiny
<i>Black Hussar Regiment</i>	Settlements	6	7.758	5	4.366	5	3.904	18	14.138
	Breeding Farms	—	—	—	—	2	3.669	1	2.240
	Total	6	7.758	5	4.366	7	7.573	19	16.378
<i>Yellow Hussar Regiment</i>	Settlements	—	—	8	8.968	7	3.737	13	7.746
	Breeding Farms	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	2.755
	Total	—	—	8	8.968	7	3.737	17	10.501
<i>Moldavian Hussar Regiment</i>	Settlements	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Breeding Farms	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Total	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<i>Yelizavetgrad Hussar Regiment</i>	Settlements	—	—	3	4.740	1	60	12	8.610
	Breeding Farms	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	2.760
	Total	—	—	3	4.740	1	60	14	11.370
<i>State Counties</i>	Settlements	1	8.000	—	—	4	6.120	7	17.700
	Breeding Farms	—	—	—	—	6	8.437	13	17.710
	Total	1	8.000	—	—	10	14.557	20	35.410
<i>St. Elizabeth Fortress County</i>	Settlements	4	1.380	2	300	7	966	5	1.624
	Breeding Farms	1	120	—	—	—	—	2	1.100
	Total	5	1.500	2	300	7	966	7	2.724
<i>Yelizavetgrad District</i>	Settlements	11	12.136	18	18.374	24	14.792	55	49.818
	Breeding Farms	1	120	—	—	8	12.106	22	26.565
	Total	12	12.256	18	18.374	32	26.898	77	76.383
Percentage of									
Total Amount		4.2	4.5	6.3	6.7	1.1	9.9	26.7	28.0

on the Yelizavetgrad district. It should be kept in mind that the majority of landlords served as officers in local regiments and could not attend to their households as long as hostilities continued. In 1771 and 1772, only 24.8 per cent of all lands

## YELIZAVETGRAD DISTRICT

1768		1769		1770		1771		1772		Total		% of Total
Grants	Desyatiny	Grants	Desyatiny	Grants	Desyatiny	Grants	Desyatiny	Grants	Desyatiny	Grants	Desyatiny	
3	804	8	9.360	7	3.832	8	8.624	6	6.983	66	59.769	81.6
1	2.725	1	2.725	1	900	1	1.269	—	—	7	13.528	18.4
4	3.529	9	12.085	8	4.732	9	9.893	6	6.983	73	73.297	26.8
20	13.911	2	2.030	6	1.936	7	6.244	5	6.000	68	50.572	84.5
8	5.500	1	1.072	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	9.327	15.5
28	19.411	3	3.102	6	1.936	7	6.244	5	6.000	81	59.899	22.0
—	—	—	—	—	—	4	5.040	4	4.630	8	9.670	82.9
—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2.000	—	—	1	2.000	17.1
—	—	—	—	—	—	5	7.040	4	4.630	9	11.670	4.3
1	180	3	2.880	4	4.320	5	3.960	6	5.760	35	30.510	54.1
1	2.500	1	500	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	5.760	15.9
2	2.680	4	3.380	4	4.320	5	3.960	6	5.760	39	36.270	13.3
1	1.500	2	2.340	2	2.880	3	2.490	1	720	21	41.750	33.7
1	1.500	1	600	1	300	1	1.690	1	1.440	24	31.677	46.3
2	3.000	3	2.940	3	3.180	4	4.180	2	2.160	45	73.427	25.0
4	3.350	3	1.310	3	2.160	4	4.320	2	3.130	34	18.540	79.1
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	3.690	7	4.910	20.9
4	3.350	3	1.310	3	2.160	4	4.320	6	6.820	41	23.450	8.6
29	19.745	18	17.970	22	15.128	31	30.678	24	27.223	232	205.864	75.4
11	12.225	4	4.898	2	1.200	3	4.959	5	5.130	56	67.202	24.6
40	31.970	22	22.867	24	16.328	34	35.637	29	32.353	288	273.066	100
13.9	11.7	7.6	8.4	8.3	6.0	11.8	13.0	10.1	11.8			

allotted were apportioned, in other words, less than in 1767 alone.

Table 6 also shows the distribution of settlements and breeding farms. The latter were most numerous in state counties where they amounted to 53.2 per cent of all lands allotted; they were least numerous in the Black Hussar Regiment, where they corresponded to 9.5 per cent of all lands allotted. Of the lands allotted in the whole district, 19.8 per cent were destined for the raising of livestock.

Table 7 provides information on the size of plots given to colonists.

TABLE 7

## SIZE OF PLOTS IN THE YELIZAVETGRAD DISTRICT

NAME OF AREA	1-23		24-47		48		Above 48		TOTAL NUMBER OF GRANTS
	Households	%	Households	%	Households	%	Households	%	
Yellow Hussar Regiment	40	49.4	18	22.2	15	18.5	8	9.9	81
Black Hussar Regiment	18	4.2	30	41.2	18	24.6	7	9.6	73
Yelizavetgrad Lancer Regiment	12	30.8	13	38.8	14	35.9	—	—	39
St. Elizabeth Fortress County	28	68.3	9	21.9	2	4.9	2	4.9	41
State County	11	24.4	20	44.4	8	38.8	6	13.4	45
Moldavian Hussar Regiment	1	11.1	4	44.5	3	23.3	1	11.1	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>38.2</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>32.7</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>288</b>

Two figures for each category of grants are given in Table 7. The first is the number of grants, the second, the percentage ratio of grants for each category to the overall number granted to each regiment. The last row of figures contains data on grants given in the whole province and on the ratio of each category to the sum total of grants. The majority (38.2 per cent) of allotted grants were of smaller size, not exceeding 23 households. Only 8.3 per cent of the grants comprised more

than 48 households. The largest number (68.3 per cent) of small size grants, ranging from 1 to 23 households, were allotted in the fortress county. Large grants were most frequently granted in state counties, where 13.4 per cent of the grants comprised 49 households or more.

It is difficult to relate these grants to individuals and to establish the amount of land held by them, since the same estate might have belonged to several persons. Deeds often helped to clarify the problem, but errors are possible even in such cases. Therefore Table 8 has only approximate value.

TABLE 8  
LANDLORDS RECEIVING LARGE GRANTS  
(49 Households or More)

Name	Number of Households	Number of <i>desyatiny</i>	Area
1. Ryshkovych, second major	260	7,890	State Counties
2. Mykhailovych, colonel	197	5,112	Black Hussar Regiment
3. Ivanov, captain	144	3,744	Black Hussar Regiment
4. Nykorytsya, captain	144	3,744	Black Hussar Regiment
5. Plovetski, second major	127	3,362	Yellow Hussar Regiment
6. Chertkov, brigadier	100	3,000	Yelizavetgrad Lancer Regiment
7. Tsvetinovich, colonel	100	2,600	Yellow Hussar Regiment
8. Uvalov, second major	100	2,600	Black Hussar Regiment
9. Korf, colonel	87	2,630	St. Elizabeth Fortress County
10. Serezliyi, lieutenant colonel	96	2,496	State Counties
11. Pantazyi, captain	96	2,496	State Counties
12. Berezanski, captain	84	2,490	St. Elizabeth Fortress County
13. Baydak, lieutenant	72	2,460	State Counties
14. Georgiyev, lieutenant	60	1,560	Black Hussar Regiment

It appears from Table 8 that the general rule was violated in favor of people serving in local regiments. The majority of these were also members of the administration. Thus, Chertkov was a commander and assistant to the commander in chief; Korf, a commander; Tsvetinovich commanded the Pandur,

Plovetski, the Yellow Hussar regiment; Plovetski was also a member of the provincial chancery and Berezhans'ki served there as secretary; Serezliyi was a regimental commander, etc. It must be stated that in addition to estates destined for settlements, many landlords were given lands for raising various breeds of cattle, as seen in the following table.

TABLE 9  
LANDS RECEIVED FOR SETTLEMENTS  
AND CATTLE BREEDING  
(Area Given in *Desyatiny*)

Name	Settlements	Cattle Breeding	Total
1. Ryskovych, second major	7,890	—	7,890
2. Mykhailovych, colonel	5,112	—	5,112
3. Serezliyi, second major	2,496	2,240	4,736
4. Pantazyi, lieutenant	2,496	2,240	4,736
5. Odobash, colonel	1,440	3,200	4,640
6. Ivanov, captain	3,744	—	3,744
7. Nykorytsya, captain	3,736	—	3,736
8. Plovetski, second major	3,302	—	3,302
9. Mykhaylovych, first major	—	3,000	3,000
10. Chertkov, brigadier	3,000	—	3,000

Thus, considerable landed property was concentrated in the hands of a small group of people in the Yelizavetgrad district. Since these people were closely connected with the administration of the region, neither the chancery's inquiry concerning persons whose holdings exceeded the prescribed norm, nor Voyeikov's decision in this inquiry brought any real results. The attention of the central authorities was drawn to the arbitrary transgression of regulations in the New Russia province. On September 25, 1773, the Council of State deliberated on a complaint filed by Zaporozhians, some of whose lands had been seized by the Yelizavetgrad district. On this occasion, one of the Council's members (probably Villebois) explained that the Zaporozhians' continuous dissatisfaction was caused by the fact that the landlords of the New Russia province

continued to buy grants, to acquire strength and to "incorporate" neighboring lands "arbitrarily" into their possessions. The Council decided to send a plenipotentiary to clarify the problem on the scene. No changes, however, were brought about by this decision.<sup>95</sup> The size of the grant allotments was increased in 1775. The minimum grant was to be 1,500 *desyatiny*, the maximum 12,000. Thus, even the largest allotments could no longer surprise anyone.

On the basis of this data, some idea of the social status of the landlords may be obtained.

TABLE 10  
SOCIAL STATUS OF LANDLORDS OF  
THE YELIZAVETGRAD DISTRICT

Categories of Persons Holding Land Grants	Black Hussar Reg't	Yellow Hussar Reg't	Yelizavetgrad Lancer Reg't	Moldavian Reg't	State Counties	St. Elizabeth Fortress County	Total	% of Total Figure
Magnates	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	0.4
Generals	—	—	—	—	1	1	2	0.8
Staff Officers	5	4	2	1	1	4	17	6.7
Company Officers	54	44	27	10	21	20	176	69.2
Sergeants	5	4	5	2	1	1	18	7.1
Physicians	1	1	—	—	1	—	3	1.3
Priests	2	3	1	—	—	—	6	2.3
Merchants	1	3	—	—	—	7	11	4.3
Civil Servants	1	1	—	—	—	—	2	0.8
Raznochintsy	3	9	1	—	—	—	13	5.1
Foreigners	2	2	1	—	—	—	5	2.0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>100.</b>

<sup>95</sup> *Arkhiv gosudarstvennogo soveta*, I, Pt. II, 218.

Thus, most of the landlords (69.2 per cent) were officers of middle rank in local regiments. This peculiarity of the New Russia province has already been noted by A. V. Florovski in the course of his study on instructions issued to representatives to the Commission of 1767.<sup>96</sup> Only Prince Shcherbatov could be numbered among magnates (and this is only tentative, since Shcherbatov has not been definitely identified). There follow two generals. Next to officers (75.9 per cent of all the landlords) and sergeants (7.1 per cent), the largest percentage (5.1 per cent) was furnished by *raznochintsy*. It is difficult to establish a given landlord's nationality. We encounter a large number of foreign family names, such as Chorba, Erdeli, Serezliy, Karachun, Odobash, Vikovych, Buzeskul, Gredeskul, etc., along with others which sound like Russian names, such as Yur'yev, Ivanov, Georgiyev, etc. In reality, they may have been foreigners. In 1760 officers of the Nova Serbiya corps submitted a collective petition concerning the establishment of an autonomous Serbian diocese in Nova Serbiya. And yet the signatures on the petition—Konstantinov, Bogdanov, Yur'yev—sound like genuine Russian names.<sup>97</sup> A survey of names of the landlords of the Yelizavetgrad district shows that most of the landlords were former officers of the Nova Serbiya corps and the Slobids'kyi regiment. All the *sotnyky* and captains had been granted officers' status and joined the ranks of the Russian nobility. Such people as Sirenko, Avramenko, Dyk, Ustymovych, etc., belonged to this category. A comparatively small group of landowners belonged to the Russian officers' corps. Korf, Chertkov and Uvalov are examples. Merchants like Pashutin, Sushilin and others should be included into the Russian group.

It is noteworthy that the percentage of Russian landowners should have been so small, especially since the lack of land

<sup>96</sup> A. V. Florovski, *Sostav zakonodatel'noi kommissii za 1767-1774 gody*. [Composition of the Commission on Codification of the Laws for the Years 1767-1774], Odessa 1915, pp. 275-76.

<sup>97</sup> Arkh. Arseni, "Sofroni Dobrashevich", *Kiyevskaya starina*, X, 1884, 300-301.



had begun to be felt in Russia. Between 1762 and 1772 lands were liberally distributed among landlords, both in Russia and in the Ukraine. Over 56,000 *desyatiny* were apportioned in these years.<sup>98</sup> In spite of the great hunger for land, the wave of people seeking apportionments did not reach the new Russia province. The explanation of this fact is to be found not in the government's hypothetical desire to preserve a nucleus of local nobility in the province, but in the difficulties which faced a landlord there. Dangers from Zaporozhians and Poles, various obstacles to the fulfillment of the colonization conditions, all these acted as deterrents to prospective landlords.

The situation was different in the Catherine district, where the landowners constituted a heterogeneous group. The district encompassed former territories of Slavyanoserbiya, the Poltava regiment, and the Voronezh province. Each one of them had been settled according to different regulations and enjoyed different rights. While land was apportioned by terms of the "Plan" of 1764 in some localities, in others it was held on the basis of old squatters' rights (*zaymanshchyna*). In its inquiry addressed to Voyeikov, the New Russia chancery pointed out the exceptional status of the Catherine district and the Bakhmut county and stated that some staff officers of the region possessed estates, whether inherited or purchased, exceeding the area prescribed for forty-eight households. Moreover, the chancery said, they were being given additional lands for forty-eight households by the government. As has been stated before, Voyeikov replied in an evasive fashion.

Instructions given by the officers of the various regiments to their representatives to the Commission of 1767 mirror the conditions of life prevailing in the Catherine district at that time. It is particularly interesting to compare them with the instructions issued by officers of the Yelizavetgrad district. While in the Catherine district the problem of the ranks' lands

<sup>98</sup> V. I. Semevski, "Razdachi naseleennykh imenii pri Yekaterine II" [The Granting of Settled Lands under Catherine II], *Otechestvennyye zapiski* [Notes of the Fatherland], Vol. 233, August 1877, p. 209.

was of minor importance, it appeared essential in the Yelizavetgrad district. Only officers of the Donets Lancer regiment spoke in their instructions of transforming the ranks' lands into unconditional property. The chief desire of other landowners was to retain in their hands the vast territories which they had occupied at a time when they still were members of the Little Russian nobility. The nobles of the Donets Lancer regiment complained that little towns, owned "of old" by the nobles, who possessed deeds proving their ownership, were taken away from them and used for settling state peasants and freeholders; the reason given for this measure was that the towns were purchased after 1739, when a decree forbade the purchase of Cossack lands. Georgians, who had received liberal grants in the Poltava regiment and joined the Donets and the Dnepr regiments in the New Russia province, asked to be left in possession of their lands, which the Catherine district chancery intended to settle with freeholders.<sup>99</sup>

The following examples give an idea of the concentration of large landed property in the hands of individual landowners: General von Stoffeln (the Donets regiment) held over 80,000 *desyatiny*; *oboznyi* Runovs'kyi, 63,000 *desyatiny*; General *oboznyi* Kochubey, 5,000 *desyatiny*; staff comrade Zaykovs'kyi, 3,800 *desyatiny*.<sup>100</sup>

The composition of the landowners' group was slightly different in Bakhmut county. In addition to the area of the former Slobids'kyi regiment, part of the lands of Slavyano-serbiya was incorporated into the county. In the latter territory, the ranks' lands and the land bought from Cossacks for fifty kopecks per *desyatina*, formed the bulk of the holdings. In view of the danger of incursions by the Crimean Tatars, landowners asked to be given other lands in exchange, lying further from the frontier. They requested "twenty-three *chetverti* (equals forty-six *desyatiny*) per serf or per the Little Russian peasants." Officers of the Bakhmut regiment requested

<sup>99</sup> *Sbornik IRIO*, XCIII, 36-37, 43-48, 57-60.

<sup>100</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, No. 1458, pp. 309-316.

individual grants of forty-six households to be held in permanent possession, in exchange for their ranks' lands. The petitioners' requests were much higher in Bakhmut county than in the Yelizavetgrad district.

As for the nationality of the landowners, insofar as it can be ascertained by the study of their family names, considerable differences existed between the north and the south. In the north, Ukrainian family names prevail, although one encounters some foreign ones, such as Von Stoffeln, Münster (Minster), Ziegler (Tsigler), etc. In Bakhmut county Serbian names such as Šterić, Šević, etc., are in majority.

It has been repeatedly stated that figures given by the notices on land apportioning in the Yelizavetgrad province are inexact. Data for the Catherine district and Bakhmut county are even less satisfactory. Skal'kovski gives the following figures: 477 grants were made in the New Russia province in 1774. 399 villages with a population of 66,430 were founded on these grants.<sup>101</sup> According to my data, 288 grants were apportioned in the Yelizavetgrad district. 189 grants should be therefore attributed to the Catherine district and Bakhmut county. This figure, of course, is only approximate.

Lands for settlements were granted on the condition that they be settled at a ratio of one household to twenty-six or thirty *desyatiny*. The colonization of landowners' estates was carried out two ways, either through the recruitment of peasants from abroad, or through a spontaneous movement of settlers. The old practice of turning to recruiting agents, who summoned and settled people for remuneration, was used to obtain settlers from abroad. Thus, the land commissioner Grachev formed settlements with the help of the recruiting agent Volkodav.<sup>102</sup> First Major Sinel'nikov notified the New Russia Provincial Chancery that he had settled twenty households near the Medvezha Balka on the Berehova River (re-

<sup>101</sup> Skal'kovskii, *Khronolog. oboz.*, I, 96.

<sup>102</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 74.

gion of the St. Parasceve (Sv. Paraskoviivs'ka) fortress with people recruited abroad.<sup>103</sup> Any number of similar situations could be quoted here.

Colonization by "volunteers" was a continuous process. It was not in the landlords' interests to interrogate settlers as to whether they had come from Poland or from Russia. All comers were accepted, whether from the Right or the Left-Bank Ukraine, Great Russia or Zaporizhzhya; there was no talk of burdensome socage; on the contrary, people were lured by promises of every kind of advantage for settling on a landlord's manor.

An interesting instruction issued by a landlord of Bakhmut county, Second Major Šterić, to the manager of his estate, Lieutenant Albans'ki, has come down to us.<sup>104</sup> Šterić, who was about to take part in a military campaign abroad, entrusted to Albans'ki the business of settling and managing the settlements of Bila, Shterychanka, Ivanivka, and Novoselivka. Albans'ki was to display caution in accepting settlers and insist on their having passports, except for those coming from Zaporizhzhya. His reward was set at two rubles for each settled household. For fear of complications, Šterić forbade him to accept fugitives from other landlords' manors, especially during the initial stages of colonization. Immigrants from Zaporizhzhya had colonized Pavlovs'ka; Šterić instructed Albans'ki to transfer them to other settlements. Trading establishments were to be built along the route of the immigrants from Zaporizhzhya to their new destination and four households settled at each establishment. Houses were to be prepared in advance for the immigrants expected from abroad. Instructions on agricultural matters which Šterić gave to Albans'ki were quite precise. He specified the area to be sowed after having been ploughed by peasants' and the landlords' own ploughs. Fourteen *chetverti* were to be sowed with oats; ten, with barley; six, with wheat; two, with buckwheat; four,

<sup>103</sup> *Arkhiv tavr. upr. gosud. im.*, IV, No. 561.

<sup>104</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 92, No. 2293.

with lentils; five, with beans; and twenty *desyatiny*, with millet. All of this to be harvested by peasants, who also were to sow winter crops. Šterić attributed great importance to the auxiliary branches of rural economy; Albans'ki, therefore, was to see that the distilleries worked well. It is possible that Šterić considered this business as one way of keeping the peasants in economic dependence. Should peasants establish mills, Albans'ki was to try to buy these and also to build others. For this purpose the miller Mykhaylo—obviously a skilled builder—was to be summoned. Šterić sought to increase the revenue of the manor by every means. He ordered beehives, 150 in number, to be built during the winter. Fruit trees were to be grafted and cherry and prune trees planted in the orchard. Šterić, to provide for the spiritual needs of the peasants, planned to have a church and a school built in every settlement. Šterić's instruction to Albans'ki depicts the economic life of a manor in a remote corner of Bakhmut county.<sup>105</sup>

The commentaries to the "Plan" throw some additional light on the relations between landlord and peasant. The New Russia Provincial Chancery asked Voyeikov about measures to be taken with respect to escaping peasants: "Little Russians," it reported, "have to work for some landlords two days a week, for others, one day only. They consider, therefore, that working for the former is a burden, and for the latter an easier thing, and, in their simplicity, they escape to the latter. For that reason, they never can have fixed abode, which circumstance renders it impossible to make a reliable census of the population." Voyeikov gave the following answer: "There is no point in equalizing (the peasants' duties).

<sup>105</sup> The son of this Šterić, Petro, followed in his father's footsteps. He was the first landlord to seek, find and exploit coal in one of the above-mentioned settlements. See: N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Materiyaly do istorii hirnychoi promyslovosty Donbasu" [Material for the History of Mining in the Donbas], *Pratsi komisii sotsiyalno-ekonomichnoi istorii Ukrainy* [Proceedings of the Commission for the Social and Economic History of the Ukraine], Vol. I, Kiev 1932, *passim*.

If the landlords would try not to overburden their peasants with work, then escapes would stop of themselves. Should a landlord impose duties on his peasants which were too severe, the latter have only to report it through the regular channels. Should due investigation disclose any real abuse, for a first offense the landlord shall retain the peasant, but the abuse will be abolished. Should the same thing happen a second time, the peasant shall be taken away from the landlord and settled elsewhere according to his wish. Fugitives and people without written certificates shall not be accepted anywhere, but sent to Russia under surveillance."<sup>106</sup>

## V. COLONIZATION OF STATE SETTLEMENTS AND TOWNS

### A. *State Settlements*

The problem of settling state settlements and regiment areas was foremost in the colonization scheme of New Russia province. It appears from the Notice of 1774 that the landlords' peasants amounted to only 17.7 per cent of the whole population, while the percentage of inhabitants of state settlements was 20.8 per cent, of servicemen and their families, 35.9 per cent, and of freeholders, 13.7 per cent. The latter groups comprised 70.4 per cent of the population. The "Plan" showed that the official colonization of the New Russia province proceeded along two lines, namely, peopling settlements with "state settlers" and of settling them with servicemen. The means and the conditions under which land was allotted to state peasants and to the servicemen of the regiments have been discussed above.

The sources of manpower for the colonies were many. The "Plan" envisaged bringing Ukrainians and "Russian people" from abroad as the main source. Naturally enough, the provincial administration relied on the help of recruiting agents

<sup>106</sup> Odess. istor. muzei, *Zbirka...*, II, 30-64.

in such cases. A recruiting agent undertook to settle a settlement within three years. Usually, land was allotted under his name, since the Provincial Chancery preferred to deal with one person. Therefore references such as "the Old Believer Antonov and his associate" or "Starikov and his associate have been allotted 3,000 *desyatiny*" are frequently encountered in the document. People of all descriptions assumed the function of recruiting agents. There were "inhabitants" of settlements among them; for instance, the "inhabitant" Bondariv settled Zolotarivka (Black Hussar Regiment area) in 1765; "inhabitant" Shurygin settled Nikol's'ka in the Yellow regiment area; Old Believers Starikov, Antonov, Balugin, settled Old Believers settlements.<sup>107</sup> In these cases the recruiting agents belonged to the same social milieu as the people recruited by them. The Zaporozhians also tried their hand at the recruiting agent's trade. In 1765, Trokhym Chelevan' and Hryts'ko Starenko were granted 3,000 *desyatiny* in the Yellow Hussar Regiment, to settle with immigrants from Poland.<sup>108</sup> In 1772, a recruiting agent, Chyhyrynets', a Zaporozhian officer, settled people from Chyhyryn along the Vovcha River.<sup>109</sup> But there were foreigners among the recruiting agents as well. Thus, Veselyi Kut was settled by the recruiting agent Rani Barzhiniy;<sup>110</sup> the Polish nobleman Krzyczynski was a well-known recruiting agent.<sup>111</sup>

In addition to recruiting agents who settled whole settlements, there existed special recruiting agents (*vyzyvately*), who went abroad, brought settlers from there and delivered them to the authorities. They were paid for each individual settler according to the tariff established in the "Plan." If they brought a large enough number of immigrants, they received commissions. We encounter officers among the large scale

<sup>107</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 121.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 191.

<sup>109</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy dlya istoriko-statist. opisaniya Yekaterinoslavskoi yeparkhii*, II, 288.

<sup>110</sup> *Arkh. krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 126.

<sup>111</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 62, No. 1458, pp. 378, 395; file 73, No. 1621.

special recruiting agents, such as Major Alymov and Prince Baratov.<sup>112</sup> Colonel Odobash brought 250 settlers to the Yelizavetgrad and the Dnepr Lancer regiments.<sup>113</sup> Peter Chorba recruited 152 families in 1773.<sup>114</sup> Lieutenant Shmit brought 150 persons in 1774.<sup>115</sup> Ensign Stavroyeni recruited 139 people capable of performing front line service and 338 *familiyaty* in the same year.<sup>116</sup> In 1769 Quartermaster Patrin recruited 250 families, 178 members of which later joined the Black Hussar regiment.<sup>117</sup> One Komburley, who was later to become famous, was granted a captain's rank for recruiting 125 Hussars and 50 *familiyaty*.<sup>118</sup> Some special recruiting agents, e. g., Second Major Gerlich, earned considerable sums of money in this way.<sup>119</sup>

The special recruiting agents of that time differed little from those of the preceding period; this difference only consisted in the type of remuneration. They no longer were given companies "in possession," but had to be content with a commission or a reward in money. Of course, even then they sometimes snatched the "prey" from one another. Thus, recruiting agent Ivanets'kyi complained in 1765 that Lieutenant Maryanovych had taken a party of gypsies away from him and had attempted to bring them into his own settlement Hlyns'k.<sup>120</sup>

Notwithstanding the zeal of the recruiting agents and the great sums allotted by the government to further the colonization, we can hardly go astray by supposing that the voluntary colonization by fugitives was more important. Fugitives from Great Russia would first go to Poland. From there, they

<sup>112</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 74.

<sup>113</sup> *PSZ*, No. 11312, August 14, 1761.

<sup>114</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 91, No. 2232.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, file 92, No. 2292.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, file 94, No. 2371.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, file 91, No. 2214.

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid.*, file 94, No. 2400.

<sup>119</sup> *Arkhiv, tavr. upr. gos. im.*, VII, No. 1017.

<sup>120</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 126.



would cross the frontier legally and receive certificates in the outposts, where formalities, e. g., questioning as to identity and place of origin, medical examinations, etc., would take place.<sup>121</sup>

It is not easy to establish the origin of the main wave of immigrants into the New Russia province. We can, however, discover the main currents of this movement. The Right-Bank Ukraine was the most frequent channel. Two streams merged there: one coming from the Polish manors in the Ukraine and another from the parts of the Ukraine dominated by the Ukrainian nobility.

Immigrants usually came individually or in small groups, though cases of migration in larger numbers are also known. For instance, 69 Cossacks, led by their chief, Sukhyna, came from Poland in 1768 and declared to Voyeikov that they intended to settle in the New Russia province.<sup>122</sup> Another route often taken by fugitives led from Great Russia to Poland, where they could enter the New Russia province according to the provisions of the various decrees and manifestoes. The testimony of Yelizavetgrad inhabitants Loskutov, Yegorov and others gives a typical illustration of this category of immigrant. In their replies to the New Russia Provincial Chancery, these men testified that they had been peasants in the palace townships (*dvortsovye volosti*), and then serfs of the manor of Count Apraksin near Bryansk; later they were sold as laborers to Goncharov, who owned a textile mill.<sup>123</sup> Since they could not bear the strenuous work there, they fled to Poland and then to Yelizavetgrad.

Many Old Believers of Great Russian origin came as im-

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 136; *Fond kiyevskogo gub. pravleniya*, No. 9473.

<sup>122</sup> N. Kostomarov, "Materialy dlya istorii Koliivshchiny ili rezni 1768 g." [Material for the History of the *Koliivshchina* or of the Massacre of 1768], *Kiyevskaya starina*, III, 1882, 319; A. Andriyevski, "Relyatsii kiyevskogo general-gubernatora za 1768 i 1769 gody" [Reports of the Governor General of Kiev for the Years 1768 and 1768] *Chteniya v istoricheskom obshchestve imeni Nestora letopistsa*, VII, 133-134.

<sup>123</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 69.

migrants from Poland or Moldavia. The arrivals of Old Believers in the New Russia province considerably increased after the promulgation of decrees which authorized them to settle and guaranteed them freedom of religion. The decree of 1764, and especially that of 1765, granted them extensive privileges, including exemption from military service. This proved to be a new stimulus to Old Believer immigration, and 2,370 Old Believers arrived in New Russia from the Right-Bank Ukraine.<sup>124</sup> This colonizing movement gained particular strength during the war of 1768-1774. At that time, Rumyantsev had 1,242 Old Believer families come from Besarabia. Some of these settled in old settlements, while others founded new ones.<sup>125</sup> The Old Believer communities in Kry-

TABLE II  
OLD BELIEVER SETTLEMENTS

Year of Founding	Area	Name	Number of Households	<i>Desyatiny</i>
1764	Black Hussar Reg't	Nova Vys'	48	1,248
		Velyka Vys'	48	1,248
1764	Yellow Hussar Reg't	Ivankivs'ka	200	6,000
		Plos'ka	190	2,860
		Galaganivka	96	2,496
1764	State Counties	Zlynka	700	21,000
		Krasnoyars'ka	700	21,000
1764	St. Elizabeth Fortress County	Klyntsi	300	9,000
		Kalynivka	200	6,000
1765	Yellow Hussar Reg't	Zolotarivka	150	3,900
		Pokrovs'ka	100	3,000
1766		Honchars'ka	48	1,248
		Kalantaiivka	130	3,860
1766	State County	Zybka	500	15,000
1767		Antonivka	124	3,250
		Yukhivka	35	920
1767	Yellow Hussar Reg't	Veselyi Kut	62	1,672
		Tonkonohivka	30	700
1770		Nykol's'ka	66	1,456

<sup>124</sup> Skal'kovskii, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 74.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 99.

ukiv and in the suburbs of the St. Elizabeth fortress grew larger during that period. According to data from 1773, there were 12,670 Old Believers of both sexes in the St. Elizabeth and Kremenchuk fortresses. In 1774, they constituted the majority of Yelizavetgrad's population. By 1773, several Old Believer settlements had been founded in the Yelizavetgrad district.

Güldenstädt devotes special attention to the Old Believer settlements. He notes that Old Believers, Great Russians by origin, strictly observed Russian customs in dress, construction methods, and agronomy; and, as opposed to the Ukrainian population, they used horses rather than oxen for draft. They began, however, step by step, to introduce certain innovations: they substituted a regular iron plough for the wooden one and built chimneys in their houses. They cultivated flax, raised vegetables, and planted orchards. As Güldenstädt has observed, they were reputed to be an industrious, sober and decent people by the inhabitants of the district.<sup>126</sup> Many of them were craftsmen or merchants. Old Believers settled almost exclusively in the Yelizavetgrad district. There were only a few of them in the Catherine district and Bakhmut county.<sup>127</sup>

The Left-Bank Ukraine and Slobids'ka Ukraine were the second permanent source of immigration to the New Russia province and especially to the Catherine district. In 1765 the Senate, granting Mel'gunov's request, authorized peasants who had been attached to Little Russian landlords for less than ten years to move freely to the Catherine district. "According to the Statute," so ran the Senate's jurisdiction, "such people are free to move wherever they want; landlords who do not contribute to the maintenance of the Slobids'ki regiments shall give up Cossacks, their relatives and *pidpomishnyky* who live on the landlord's estates, eschewing service. These people shall be moved to the Catherine district with

<sup>126</sup> Güldenstädt, *op. cit.*, II, 142, 171, 173, 188.

<sup>127</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 92, No. 2293.

all their possessions, and the landlords (will be) prevented from taking them away illegally." People who had served with landlords for more than ten years were not granted the right to leave. Those, however, who had succeeded in leaving, could not be forced to return. Further movement of the *Cherkasy* (a contemporary Russian term for Ukrainians), however, was to be prohibited.<sup>128</sup> This is an important decree, since it specified which categories of Russian subjects were entitled to move into the Catherine district. At the same time, it reiterated the prohibition that no one but immigrants from abroad could be accepted into the New Russia province.

There was also a mass movement of peasants from various localities of the Left-Bank Ukraine. A recruiting agent, Prot-senko, brought people from the Hlukhiv region and settled Lozovatka with them in 1768.<sup>129</sup> By a Senate decree of 1773, peasants from the Poltava region were moved to the area of the Samara River.<sup>130</sup>

Of course, the movement of people from the Left-Bank Ukraine and Slobids'ka Ukraine was not limited to legal channels. A continuous stream of fugitives, Cossacks and *pospolyti* was of even greater importance. The local nobility, growing in strength and aspiring to equality with the "well-born Russian nobility," imposed heavy burdens on the *pospolyti*. An increase in all sorts of levies led to their fleeing to Zaporizhzhya, the Right-Bank Ukraine or Southern Ukraine, in ever increasing numbers. The situation in Slobids'ka Ukraine was no better. The transformation of Cossack regiments into Dragoon and Hussar regiments and increased taxation caused continuous dissatisfaction among the population and was the reason for frequent desertion by Cossacks who refused to serve in the newly formed regiments or *pospolyti* who

<sup>128</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XII, 51-53.

<sup>129</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, I, 248-249.

<sup>130</sup> Miller, *Istoricheskiye sochineniya...*, 53-54.

fled the heavy burden of serfdom.<sup>131</sup> The archives of the New Russia Provincial Chancery contain a large number of complaints filed by landlords against those who sheltered their fugitive peasants in New Russia and demands that the escaped serfs be returned. The provincial administration was caught between two fires: on one hand, complaints required action; on the other, demands of superior authorities, desirous of increasing the population in the region, and the requests of local landlords, often interested in having abundant manpower at their disposal, had to be heeded. Therefore, the administration followed the line of least resistance and closed its eyes to the influx of fugitives. The memorandum sent by the provincial chancery of Slobids'ka Ukraine to Governor Shcherbinin in 1774 and forwarded by the latter to the commander in chief of the province of New Russia, Potemkin, deserves to be mentioned here. It pointed out that landlords' manors were losing manpower as a consequence of the peasants' escaping to the New Russia province. Potemkin ordered the fugitives to be returned at the expense of landlords who had received them on their estates, but this order seems to have remained without effect.<sup>132</sup>

While the main group of the Russian population in the Yelizavetgrad district consisted of Old Believers, it was the freeholders who provided the core of Russian inhabitants in the Catherine district and Bakhmut county.<sup>133</sup> Colonization by freeholders went back to the time of the construction of the "Ukrainian Line." In addition to "territorial militia" regiments, the settlements along the Line and to the south of

<sup>131</sup> *Kniga dlya chteniya po istorii narodov SSSR* [Book of Readings in the History of the Peoples of the USSR], I, 194; P. Golovinski, *Slobodskiye kozach'i polki*, pp. 176-173; D. Bahaliy, *Istoriya Slobids'koi Ukrainy* [History of Slobids'ka Ukraine], Kharkiv 1918, pp. 105-106.

<sup>132</sup> A. L. Shimanov, "Predsmertnaya bor'ba zaporozhtsev" [Premortem Struggle of the Zaporozhians], *Kiyevskaya starina*, V, 1883, 629.

<sup>133</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 99, No. 2393.

it were settled by freeholders.<sup>134</sup> They were highly esteemed as military men. Manshtein wrote that the best regiments of Russia were manned by freeholders.<sup>135</sup> The Russian government was of the same opinion. According to the data collected by A. Skal'kovski, twenty settlements along the Orel, the Mayachka and the Lupnyazhka rivers belonged to freeholders.<sup>136</sup> Statistical information pertaining to the year 1762 on sixteen freeholder settlements is given in the following table.<sup>137</sup>

TABLE 12  
FREEHOLDER SETTLEMENTS

Name	Male Population	<i>Desyatiny</i>
1. Pishchanka Mala	334	5,351
2. Starovirs'ka	1,298	17,482
3. Berestova	457	6,360
4. Linivka	479	8,102
5. Starookhotna	969	11,834
6. Yefremivka	122	11,660
7. Oleksiivka	716	4,752
8. Bereka	1,592	12,924
9. Mykhaylivka	265	8,977
10. Shabelinka	736	6,816
11. Larivka	296	11,481
12. Milova	452	15,465
13. Novoobids'ka	428	3,271
14. Petrova	568	8,631
15. Ver'ovkina	379	6,070
16. Protopopivka	—	11,719

<sup>134</sup> Bagalei, *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii stepnoi okrainy moskovskogo gosudarstva*, pp. 312, 318-322; *Senatskii arkhiv*, XV, 458-461.

<sup>135</sup> Manshtein, *Zapiski o Rossii*, pp. 67-68.

<sup>136</sup> These twenty settlements were: Petrivs'ka, Ver'yovkina, Protopopivka, Milova, Lozoven'ka, Mykhaylivka, Shabelinka, Nova Byyukina, Byyukins'ki Ver-shyny, Aladiivka, Berets'ki Ver-shyny, Starookhocha, Linivka, Starovirivka, Berestovo, Pishchanka, Lebyzhyns'ka, Zalineyna, Orchakivs'ka, Ryaz'ka Vasyliivs'ka. See, Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 91-92.

<sup>137</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 62, No. 1453.

It appears from the Table 12 that some settlements were well provided with land. In Bereka, for instance, the ratio was 74 *desyatiny* for each male inhabitant, and in Larivka 38 *desyatiny*. In other settlements, however, this ratio was considerably less generous. In Oleksiivka it was 6.6 *desyatiny* per person, in Novoobids'ka, 7.6, in Shabelinka, 9.

Güldenstädt notes that the number of freeholders was continually increased by arrivals from Slobids'ka Ukraine and the Voronezh province. He describes a cluster of freeholder settlements along the Torets', the Aydar and the Zherebets' rivers. For the most part, the freeholders did not mix with the Ukrainian population, although they took over some practices from the Ukrainians—they used ploughs, worked with oxen in addition to horses, built chimneys on their houses, etc. But their external appearance remained Russian; they did not shave their heads and they wore bast shoes; generally speaking, men and women were dressed in the Great Russian fashion. Willows and poplars were planted around freeholder settlements, which gave an impression of orderliness. Orchards, however, were seldom to be found in these settlements.

In addition to freeholders many peasants emigrated from Russia to the Catherine district and Bakhmut county.<sup>138</sup> In 1772-3 immigrants from the Sevs'k district colonized Fashchivka on the Mius River. It had 365 male and 343 female inhabitants and 107 households by 1774.<sup>139</sup> In the same year, a second group of Sevs'k emigrants founded the settlement of Chernukhyna on the Chernukha River and in Popovyi Yar. By 1772, it had 813 male and 291 female inhabitants.<sup>140</sup> In 1772 peasants from the Orel and Kurs'k provinces were settled along the Luhanchyk, near Shenkov Protoka. The settlement

<sup>138</sup> D. Bagalei, ed., "Dnevnik puteshestviya po Slobodskoi ukrainskoi gubernii akademika Gil'denshtedta" [Diary of the Journey of Academician Güldenstädt through Slobids'ka Ukraine], *Khar'kovski sbornik*, [Khar'kov Collection], 1891, pp. 16, 17, 19, 56, 59-60, 63-65.

<sup>139</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, II, 99-101.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 103-104.

numbered 380 male and 367 female inhabitants.<sup>141</sup> In 1774 the settlement of "Her Imperial Majesty's own palace peasants" from the Sevs'k district had begun in the state settlements of Bakhmut county, such as Velyka and Mala Katerynivka, Protopopivka and Utkyna.<sup>142</sup> From 1770 on, retired soldiers of Russian nationality were settled along the frontier of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" on the Zhrebets' and the Kins'ka.<sup>143</sup> Thus the influx of Russian immigrants was continuous. It was even more considerable in the colonization of towns. This matter, however, shall be discussed later.

Another stream of settlers flowing into the New Russia province originated in Zaporizhzhya. The existence of a counter-current should be noted, however, since the population also moved from the New Russia province into Zaporizhzhya. The already quoted Instruction of Mel'gunov ordered Colonel Shabel'ski to receive Ukrainians, Zaporozhians, and foreigners into the Lancer regiments and to pay each Ukrainian and Zaporozhian a bonus of twelve rubles.<sup>144</sup> The Zaporozhians repeatedly complained that the inhabitants of their "Free Lands" were escaping to the New Russia province. The establishment of the "Dnepr Line" caused particular dissatisfaction among them.<sup>145</sup>

Judge Tymofliyiv wrote to Kalnyshevs'kyi, that Zaporozhian Cossacks were settling along the "Dnepr Line," a circumstance which was of considerable concern to the Host. Also *pospolyti* moved from Zaporizhzhya into these regions, to escape the fulfillment of obligations imposed by the Host on its subjects.<sup>146</sup> Since the complaints were raised by Zaporozh-

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 124.

<sup>142</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 92, No. 2293.

<sup>143</sup> V. A. Den, *Naseleniye Rossii po III revizii* [The Population of Russia According to the Third Census], II, 79; Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 86.

<sup>144</sup> Ternovski, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>145</sup> Novitski, *Istoriya goroda Aleksandrovskaya*, p. 17.

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.



ians during the Turkish War when the Army needed the latter's support, Prince Dolgoruki, commander of the Army, approached the New Russia Provincial Chancery in 1771 and demanded that all Zaporozhian subjects hiding in the province be returned to the Host.<sup>147</sup> The chancery replied, however, that no Zaporozhian Cossacks were hiding in its area. Still, it admitted, that many Cossacks had married and enrolled into the Lancer regiments between 1768 and 1770. One could quote many more similar facts. The Notice compiled in the Yelizavetgrad district chancery in 1765 sums them up in a most instructive way. It is said in this document that 2,311 male and 1,882 female "Polish and Russian Little Russians," i. e., 4,193 persons, or 40% of all new arrivals, had come from Zaporizhzhya to the Yelizavetgrad district in the course of 1765.<sup>148</sup> Zaporozhian subjects settled not only in state settlements, but also on landlords' estates. In his instruction to Albans'ki, Šterić pointed out that they were most desirable as colonists.<sup>149</sup>

At first sight, it may appear strange that people should have escaped from Zaporizhzhya, the very territory which for such a long time had been the promised land for all those whom fate ill-treated at home. According to some historians, equality and brotherhood reigned in Zaporizhzhya. In reality, it was otherwise. Beginning with the second half of the eighteenth century the Zaporozhian nobility grew wealthier at the expense of the *pospolyti* and became a large landowner class. Rank-and-file Cossacks and *pospolyti* suffered from the oppression of the new landowners and from ever heavier obligations toward the Host, whether these obligations took the form of payment in kind or money, or in quartering and transporting duties, or military service. Taxes were so high that the population often refused to pay them and the admin-

<sup>147</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 84, No. 1958.

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, file 92, No. 2293.

<sup>149</sup> *Ibid.*

istration had to resort to coercive measures.<sup>150</sup> It is in this period that rebellions against the nobility occurred in Zaporizhzhya. No wonder, then, that people sought to leave the "Free Lands." Right across the border, there lay the province of New Russia, where people of all descriptions were being urged to settle, where one was even paid for enrolling in a regiment, and where colonists were lured by all kinds of privileges to settle on a landlord's manor.

Foreign settlements occupy a noteworthy place in the history of the colonization of the New Russia province. The establishment of the province in 1764 coincided with a period of intensive governmental efforts to attract foreign colonists. In that year the following proposal of the Commission for the Protection of Foreigners was sent to all border regions: "People of any nationality and observance crossing the border with the intention of entering service or settling in the New Russia province shall be immediately admitted into the aforementioned province. They shall not be asked their nationality or observance or required to produce passports."<sup>151</sup> At the same time, Mel'gunov dispatched emissaries abroad to induce merchants from Prussia, Pomerania, Brandenburg, and other regions to come to New Russia.

By 1765, the activity of the special recruiting agents had become energetic. Colonel Filipovych, assisted by a certain Myrolyub, Major Bashkovych, Lieutenants Roste, Stefanov, Chechuliy, Ratmet, Nikolayev, Fedorov and others were sent abroad in that year. They recruited Moldavians and Vlaxhs, Bulgarians, Greeks, Prussians, and "the Emperor's subjects" (inhabitants of the Austrian Empire).<sup>152</sup> All new colonists

<sup>150</sup> Evarnitski, *Istoriya zaporozhskogo kozachestva*, I, 501, 506; M. Slabchenko, "Sotsiyal'no-pravna organizatsiya Zaporiz'koi Sichi" [The Socio-legal organization of the Zaporozhian Sich], *Pratsi komisii dlya vyuch. istorii zakhidn'o-rus'koho ta ukrains'koho prava* [Proceedings of the Commission for the Study of the History of West-Russian and Ukrainian Law], Kiev 1927, III, 24, 33, 49, 57.

<sup>151</sup> *Fond kiyevskoi gub. kantsel.*, No. 6321.

<sup>152</sup> *Fond kiyevskoi gub. kantsel.*, II, 1637, 5262, sheets 1, 281, 187; No. 6397, sheets 1-2; No. 7411.

were first settled in Kiev's Podol. From there, they were distributed among the various provinces, including New Russia.<sup>153</sup> In 1767 mass recruiting of foreigners came to a halt and the Commission for the Protection of Foreigners ceased its activities.<sup>154</sup> Foreigners continued to arrive of course, but only on an individual basis or as a result of the activity of recruiting agents who worked at their own risk and responsibility.

For the New Russia province, the effects of official foreign recruitment were rather insignificant, since foreigners were more apt to go to the provinces of Saratov, St. Petersburg or Chernihiv. They only arrived one by one in New Russia.<sup>155</sup> Colonization not connected with the activity of the Commission for the Protection of Foreigners was of greater importance.

Among the nationalities settled in the New Russia province, the Greeks, Bulgarians and Moldavians deserve special mention. The Greeks lived as a compact group in Yelizavetgrad. They began to settle there after the establishment of the fortress and grew in importance during the period of the New Russia province. There were immigrants from Macedonia, Constantinople, Austria, the Crimea and nearby Nizhyn among them. Towards the end of the fifties, their colony numbered about fifty persons; towards the end of the century this number rose to about a hundred. Some of the Greeks were artisans, but most of them were merchants trading with Russia, the Left-Bank Ukraine and Moldavia. In 1764 they asked to be given a charter, similar to that held by their community in Nizhyn, which would guarantee their autonomy in matters of justice and administration and their independence from local authorities. The charter was granted in 1765 and the Greeks formed a "Merchants' Board." In 1764 the Greek com-

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 5202, sheets 110, 155.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 6397, sheets 1-2.

<sup>155</sup> Klaus, *Nashi kolonii*, II, 9-42.

munity obtained the right to build a church of its own and to hold services in the Greek language.<sup>156</sup>

The Bulgarians played a fairly important part in the colonization of the region. In addition to individuals and small groups who crossed the frontier, several large scale migrations of Bulgarians are known. In 1773, 400 families from Silistriya, Rushchuk, Vadal, and Dobrudja notified Rumyantsev of their desire to migrate to Russia.<sup>157</sup> Rumyantsev assigned the task of organizing this migration to Major Šterić, who settled the Bulgarians in the Yelizavetgrad district, namely, in Adzhamka, Dmytrivka and Dykivka. A part of these settlers was transferred to Vil'shanka on the Synyukha.<sup>158</sup> An interesting document on Bulgarian migration led by Šterić has come down to us. It is not clear, however, whether it refers to the migration of 1773-74 or to some other similar movement. Šterić brought with him 200 Bulgarian families from the Danube basin. The party numbered over 1,000 persons; they came in 300 wagons laden with goods and they brought 1,115 head of cattle along with them. Šterić planned to direct them to Bakhmut county, but during their stay in the quarantine of Semlek, the Bulgarians were dissuaded from going there by a local merchant, Manuylo Popovych, and expressed the wish to stay in the Yelizavetgrad district. Šterić complained to the New Russia Provincial Chancery that "by his personal efforts he had recruited immigrants from beyond the Danube, suffered all sorts of adversities and lost all his property." Nevertheless, the Provincial Chancery recognized the Bulgarians' right to settle where they wished.<sup>159</sup> But the Bulgarians were dissatisfied with living conditions in the Yelizavetgrad district and in 1774 petitioned Voyerikov to permit them to return to Moldavia. Voyerikov refused to grant such a

<sup>156</sup> Yastrebov, "Greki v Yelisavetgrade," *Kiyevskaya starina*, VIII, 1884, 673-75, 639-83.

<sup>157</sup> V. Lobachevski, "Bugskoye kozachestvo i voyennye poseleniya" [The Bug Cossacks and Military Settlements], *Kiyevskaya starina*, XIX, 1887, 595.

<sup>158</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 84, No. 1932, sheets 39-44.

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid.*, file 84, No. 1932.

request, so the Bulgarians were settled in the areas of the Black, Yellow and Yelizavetgrad regiments. Still, many of them fled abroad across the Southern Bug and the Synyukha.<sup>160</sup>

Many Vlaxhs and Moldavians arrived in the New Russia province between 1760 and 1770. Jassy and Focsani lost a large percentage of their population by 1765 and the whole monastery of Buzuluk moved to New Russia. The movement of Vlaxhs and Moldavians increased during the Turkish War, since Moldavians serving in the Turkish army were eager to desert and settle in New Russia. For instance, a large Moldavian and Walachian unit commanded by Skarzhyns'ki moved to New Russia and was allotted lands along the Southern Bug, forming the nucleus of the Bug regiment.<sup>161</sup>

Colonel Vasili Lupul-Zverev, an officer of the Russian army, was particularly active in persuading Moldavians to migrate to the New Russia province. Acting in the name of the Russian government, he dispatched a number of manifestoes in 1769, stating that Catherine II had appointed him "to receive and escort people of his nationality into the Nova Serbiya land." Lupul-Zverev advised all Moldavians to leave the Turkish army and become subjects of the "Orthodox Empress." Later, Lupul-Zverev claimed to have recruited over 30,000 Moldavians between 1769 and 1771. These immigrants were organized into a Moldavian regiment.<sup>162</sup> According to the data collected by Bishop Feodosii, in 1771 Lupul-Zverev settled 1,015 people in the Pavlovs'ka company; 2,169 people in Zlynka; 1389 in Vyska; 1,355 in the Lysa Hora company; 1,652 in the Ternivka company; 493 in the Dobryans'ka company; 869 in the Pischanyi Brid company; 48 in the company of Pletenyi Tashlyk; 1,858 in the company of Hruz'ka; 1,856

<sup>160</sup> Lobachevski, *op. cit.*, p. 591.

<sup>161</sup> Skal'kovski, "Yeshche o bugskikh kozakakh" [More on the Bug Cossacks], *Kiyevskaya starina*, IV, 1882, 598; Lobachevski, *op. cit.*, p. 596.

<sup>162</sup> Odess. ist. muzei, *Zbirka...*, 11, 31, 65, sheet 95; 11-30-64, sheet 107; Skal'kovski, *Opyt statisticheskogo opisaniya...*, I., 58; and his, "Rumynskiye doblesti" [Rumanian achievements], *Zapiski odesskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XX, 1897, Part 2, p. 36.

in the Lypnyazhka company; 896 in the Tyshkivka company and 1,925 in the Synyushyn Brid company. In all, Lupul-Zverev settled over 15,000 people.<sup>163</sup> The Moldavian colonization continued into subsequent years. Over 1,000 Vlaks, recruited by Ensign Stanishev, crossed the frontier in 1773 and settled in the Moldavian regiment area. Also the quartermaster of the regiment, Shmit, settled 150 people in the regiment area. A part of the Moldavians settled in the settlements of Bechka and Murzyno devastated by the Tatar incursions of 1769.<sup>164</sup>

Undaunted by his experience with Moldavian volunteer colonists, by 1771 Šterić succeeded in settling 3,585 Moldavian and Walachian prisoners of war and their families (there were 1,761 men and 1,834 women in the group) in Bakhmut county. In the Bakhmut Hussar regiment, 487 men were enrolled, 197 served as "reserves" and the rest were considered as *familiyaty*.<sup>165</sup> In some cases, Moldavians and Vlaks came to the Catherine district and Bakhmut county of their own accord. In 1770, they settled in the settlements of Yasenovata Zemlyanka, Zalizna, all on the Kryvyi Torets', the settlements Hosudariv Bayrak on the Luhan' and several along the Solona. Güldenstädt remarks that Moldavians and Vlaks were rapidly assimilated among the Ukrainian population and differed little from the Ukrainians in customs and dress.<sup>166</sup>

Moldavians, Vlaks and Bulgarians served mainly in the Moldavian Hussar regiment. Its settlements cut deeper than those of other regiments into Zaporozhian lands and exerted a pressure upon the Cossack homesteads and winter quarters. Since large grants of land belonging to Zaporozhian "Free Lands" were given to these foreign colonists, the struggle for land between the New Russia province and Zaporizhzhya

<sup>163</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, Vol. I. *passim*.

<sup>164</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 91, No. 2269; file 75, No. 1714; file 84, No. 1932, respectively.

<sup>165</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, II, pp. 38, 39, 43, 65.

<sup>166</sup> Güldenstädt, *op. cit.*, II, 174.

was especially bitter in that area.<sup>167</sup> Not only the interests of the Zaporozhians, but also those of other Ukrainian inhabitants were sacrificed to the advantage of the Moldavians, who came into possession of the lands belonging to these people and forced them to leave and settle elsewhere. Bishop Feodosii gives an idyllic description of the relationship; according to him Ukrainians and Russians everywhere welcomed the newcomers and easily came to terms with them. Whenever coexistence proved impossible, they voluntarily surrendered their houses, households, churches, and dispensaries to the immigrants for an insignificant indemnity paid by the treasury, and moved on to settle elsewhere. Lelekivka, Lypnyazhka, Hruz'ka, etc., were colonized in this manner.<sup>168</sup> It is not difficult to read between the lines of this description and to guess under what ruinous and deplorable circumstances the Ukrainian population was ousted from its home.

For the sake of completeness, the Georgians will be mentioned here, although this group did not play an important part in the colonization of the New Russia province. A part of the land occupied by Georgians was incorporated into the New Russia province together with a belt on the left bank, formerly belonging to the Poltava regiment. Georgian "princes" and nobles settled there in the beginning of the eighteenth century. A prince was awarded thirty households, a noble ten. When the Catherine district was established, these formed a separate group of landlords connected with the Donets and Dnepr Lancer regiments.<sup>169</sup> Another group of 166 Georgians was brought from the Crimea, mainly from Kaffa, in 1772. They were awarded lands in the areas of the Zakhariivs'ka and Petrovs'ka fortresses, but, since they were unwilling to remain there, they were first moved to Taganrog and then to Bakhmut, where most of them enrolled in the army. They

<sup>167</sup> Skal'kovski, "Rumynskiyе dobresti", *Zapiski odess. ob...*, XX, 37.

<sup>168</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, I, 5.

<sup>169</sup> *Sbornik IRIO*, XCIII, 37-46.

did not found settlements of their own, but scattered among the existing villages.<sup>170</sup>

We do not possess precise data illustrating the colonization movement. The more interesting, therefore, is Mel'gunov's report, since it indicates the number of people of various nationalities who had settled in the Yelizavetgrad district in 1764-5. Data from this report is reproduced in the following table.<sup>171</sup>

TABLE 13  
IMMIGRANTS ARRIVING IN YELIZAVETGRAD  
DISTRICT (1764-1765)

Nationality	Male	Female	Total	Percentage
Serbs	40	12	52	8.4
Macedonians	17	—	17	
Bulgarians	14	6	20	
Hungarians	14	2	16	
Georgians	1	—	1	
Germans	10	5	15	
Turks and Jews	14	3	17	
Moldavians and Vlakhs	462	264	726	
Polish & Russian "Little Russians" coming from Zaporizhzhya	2,311	1,882	4,193	40.7
Russians				
a) Orthodox	160	84	244	2.4
b) Old Believers	2,744	2,246	4,990	48.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,787</b>	<b>4,504</b>	<b>10,291</b>	<b>100.</b>

This sample, although taken at random, gives an approximate idea of the ratio of colonists of various nationalities to one another in New Russia. These proportions, of course, varied from year to year; in some years the number of foreign colo-

<sup>170</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 90, Nos. 21, 61.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, file 63, No. 1464, sheet 17.



nists was higher than in others, but never did it equal that of Ukrainian immigrants. Moreover, it should be kept in mind that the data of Table 13 refer to the Yelizavetgrad district, where foreign colonization was greater than in the Catherine district or Bakhmut county.

### B. *Town Population*

As has been stated above, the number and size of the towns in the province of New Russia was small. In fact, they differed but little from villages in their external appearance. We possess no direct data on the size of the town population. It is possible, however, to come indirectly to conclusions on this subject on the basis of the — not quite reliable — Notice of 1774, the figures of which are manifestly too low. The final draft of the Notice dates from 1786 and its aim was to show the increase in the province's population during the twelve preceding years. Its data enable us to establish the approximate ratio of the town people to the rest of the population. The total figure of the male population, excluding the military, the clergy and the nobility, given by the Notice amounts to 107,008 persons; among these, merchants and craftsmen account for 2,746 men, or 2.5 per cent of the total figure.<sup>172</sup> Of course, the total population of the towns must have been larger; but these two categories constituted its chief elements.

The slow development of towns was connected with the low level of industry. Townspeople led a life which differed but little from that of the settlement inhabitants. Agriculture and cattle breeding, not industry or commerce, were the chief source of livelihood for townsmen. In this respect, the towns of the Southern Ukraine resembled the towns of the left bank, which were going through a period of decline and stagnation at that time.<sup>173</sup>

Merchants who, economically, were among the more power-

<sup>172</sup> *Moskovski otdel obshchego arkhiva glavnogo shtaba*, List 194; file II, No. 225, p. 12.

<sup>173</sup> *Sbornik IRIO*, VIII, 71, 72, 133-134.

ful elements of the town population, displayed great energy in trying to secure lands for horse and sheep raising, orchards, and mills. They even were granted lands for agricultural settlements until Voyeikov put an end to the practice. Then merchants like Sushylin, Krasnoglazov and some others, who had been granted lands for that purpose, speedily registered them as destined for the raising of livestock. The attempts of merchants to secure land met with protests on the part of the nobility, which expressed its disapproval in the instructions issued to its representatives to the Commission of 1767. For instance, the nobility of Bakhmut county complained that merchants had seized the best lands and places for mills, homesteads, agriculture, and cattle raising. They asked that merchants be forbidden to own land and be compelled "to be content with their revenues from commerce and business."<sup>174</sup>

An interesting polemic took place between the merchant Belezliy, a representative from Yelizavetgrad, and S. Moroz, representing the settlers of different regiments of the Yelizavetgrad district. Belezliy complained that merchants were not being given land for cattle raising and that the peasants and hussars were taking commerce and business into their own hands.<sup>175</sup> To this Moroz replied that merchants were being provided with sufficient land, and those among them who had none had obviously asked for none, since grants were never refused. Moreover, Moroz said, the whole town population of the province amounted to scarcely two thousand. Should peasants and hussars be deprived of the chance to trade, they would have no means of livelihood.<sup>176</sup> The representatives of the nobility answered the merchant protests against officers and landlords engaging in business in similarly strong terms.

It appears from the complaints and requests submitted to the Commission of 1767 by representatives of the three es-

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, XCIII, 75.

<sup>175</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 71-72.

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 130-134.

tates, the gentry, the merchants, and the peasants, that their respective rights were but vaguely defined and their interests continuously conflicting. In an "Opinion" submitted to the Commission, deputy Belezliy introduced certain proposals aimed at improving the status of townspeople, particularly merchants. City councils, Belezliy wrote, should be created in each town and granted privileges; townspeople should be exempt from billeting and transport duty, which should be replaced by a barracks building tax of two kopecks per person. The postal service should be run by the treasury and the transportation service remunerated. Merchants should be exempted from internal taxes, i. e., pay only custom duties, and be given pasture lands for their cattle; no one, except merchants, should be allowed to engage in trade; the status of merchant or burgess should be granted with great caution upon receipt of recommendations; and no peasant, except a freed serf, should be granted such status. Skilled craftsmen should be organized into guilds; only those in possession of a guild certificate should be allowed to practice their profession. Municipal revenues should be left to each town in order that burgesses might maintain schools and hospitals; banks should be founded in each province and district and the merchants allowed to receive loans from them. Finally, peasants should be allowed to trade in their produce only, not in wares bought elsewhere.<sup>177</sup> The importance of the "Opinion" lies not only in the fact that it contains a project of reform, but also in that it points to features in town life, which were considered objectionable by the merchant class.

In the absence of banks, churches acted as money-lenders in that period. The money collected in churches was lent to various persons at interest. Lists of debtors who had borrowed some sum from the Yelizavetgrad church funds have come down to us. There were only two debtors in 1765: Captain Kyshka, who had borrowed 100 rubles and a Greek merchant by the name of Vasyliy, who had borrowed 140 rubles. In

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 71-73.

1766, the number of debtors went up to sixteen, all but four of whom were merchants. Of these four, Lieutenant Colonel Mykhalcha borrowed 1,000 rubles, First Major Serezliy, 600; Sergeant Baki, 200; and Vasyliv, a priest, 70 rubles. Among the merchants, the largest sum (4,750 rubles) was borrowed by Stepan Pashutin. Fundukliy was lent 1,000 rubles; Belezliy, Fedir Senkovs'kiy, and Trofimov, 500 rubles each, Nikolayev, Dobryts'kiy and Krokhnal', 300 rubles each; Selin, 200 rubles, and Titov, 100 rubles. Most of them borrowed the sums for a period of one year; only in four cases did the term run for six months.<sup>178</sup>

The instructions to the merchant deputies to the Commission of 1767 stressed the dangers of competition from the nobility and peasants. It must be admitted that the nobility, i. e., the officers of the local regiments, were active traders. It is quite possible that the sums quoted above were borrowed by officers to use in trade. The case of Second Major Konstantin Ivanov, initiated in 1772, provides a good illustration for business methods of the period. In 1771 Stojko Stojanovyč, master of the butchers' guild of Novomyrhorod, undertook to deliver, within a certain time, 200 *kameni* (an undetermined measure of volume, sq., *kamen'*) of fat at one ruble 20 kopecks per *kamen'* to Ivanov. If he could not deliver on time he would have to pay Ivanov two rubles per *kamen'*, instead of the one ruble and 20 kopecks which he had already received. Previously he received an advance of 240 rubles from Ivanov. But he fled without fulfilling the contract. The investigation, conducted by the Merchants' Administration and the land commissioner, Second Major Grachev, disclosed that Ivanov exported the fat abroad "endangering the interests of the merchants by his extensive commercial operation with foreign countries." Moreover, he lent money at an "un-Christian" rate of interest (eighty kopecks to a ruble). In his report to the Yelizavetgrad district chancery, Grachev asked for an order to close the proceedings against Stojanovyč; he also ask-

<sup>178</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 188.

ed that Ivanov be compelled to follow Voyeikov's orders and be forbidden to trade with foreign countries; also, the Merchants' Administration should be instructed not to confirm such illegal contracts as that between Ivanov and Stojanovyč.<sup>179</sup>

Ivanov's name often occurs in the records of the sixties. He traded regularly with the inhabitants of Smila, exchanged letters of credit with them, sold cattle, horses, etc. Of course, he was not the only army officer of this kind. Thus Doni, also an officer, traded in wax<sup>180</sup> A mere mention of the large herds of cattle sold abroad by officers must suffice here. Captain Karachun occupied a prominent place among the officers who engaged in trade. Güldenstädt writes that Karachun obtained permission to found a company in Semlyak for trade with foreign countries. The company was to export cattle, wagons, honey, wool and flax to Silesia and more distant regions; import brandy from Poland, and wool, silk fabrics, and fine cloth from Germany.<sup>181</sup>

The question of the expanding of foreign trade ranked among the main problems of the region's reorganization. On May 8, 1764, Catherine II wrote in her rescript to the Russian minister resident at the Porte, Obreskov: "Today, in appointing our Lieutenant General Mel'gunov commander in chief of Nova Serbiya, we instructed him to do his best to develop commerce in that region." Mel'gunov, therefore, was to send "experienced" merchants and "officials" to Constantinople, to establish trade relations with the merchants of that city. A few months later, on July 8, 1764, Obreskov was notified by a rescript that merchants would arrive, not only to find "ways advantageous to the carrying on of trade operations," but also to establish trading posts in Constantinople, Kilia, Bendery, Bilhorod (Akkerman) and Jassy.<sup>182</sup> It seems that

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>180</sup> Collection of documents belonging to N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko.

<sup>181</sup> Güldenstädt, *op. cit.*, II, 158.

<sup>182</sup> *Sbornik moskovskogo glavnogo arkhiva ministerstva inostrannykh del* [Collection of the Central Moscow Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs], Issue 3-4, Appendix 20, p. XXVII.

the trading posts were never founded, but individual merchants were able to establish close trade connections with Constantinople. In 1768, an Yelizavetgrad merchant, Semen Senkovs'kiy, who traded in Russian wares with Constantinople via Hadji-bey (Gadzhibeï), borrowed 2,170 *levka* (monetary unit, *lev*) from the Russian plenipotentiary at the Porte, N. I. Levashev. According to an entry made by Levashev, Senkovs'kiy transferred his debt to the Greek fur guild of Constantinople.<sup>183</sup> It appears from this episode that Senkovs'kiy was quite familiar with conditions in Constantinople. Another member of the Senkovs'kiy family, Fedir by name, also traded in Russian wares with Constantinople.<sup>184</sup> The Turkish war interrupted these trade relations. In the memorandum on the causes of the Russo-Turkish war, which Faune submitted to Louis XV, a prominent place is accorded to reasons of a commercial nature. The Black Sea trade, Faune points out, is as important for Russia, as the trade with America is for France, Spain, or England, with this difference, this trade is more natural for Russia, since its markets lie at Russia's door, as it were. It was Peter I, the memorandum goes on, who opened the way for commercial expansion by the conquest of Azov. Neither he nor his successors have ever lost sight of this important consideration.<sup>185</sup> However, in view of the war, Russia was forced to redirect its trade temporarily and to channel it towards the Crimea.<sup>186</sup>

Very active commercial relations were developed between the New Russia province and the Right-Bank Ukraine which

183 A. Markevich, "Gorod Kachibeï ili Gadzhibeï — predshestvennik goroda Odessy" [The Town of Kachibeï or Gadzhibeï—Precursor or the City of Odessa], *Zapiski odesskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XVII, 1894, 48.

184 G. Sokolov, "Istoricheskaya i statisticheskaya zapiska o voyennom gorode Yelishavetgrade" [Historical and Statistical Account of the Military Town of Yelishavetgrad], *Zapiski odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, II, 384 ff.

185 *Sbornik moskovskogo glavnogo arkhiva ministerstva inostrannykh del*, Issue 3-4, p. 167.

186 *Arkhiv gosudarstvennogo soveta*, I, Book 2, 593-594.

also served as an intermediary in the province's trade with the centers of distant Europe. Commercial relations with the Right-Bank Ukraine are well proven. In a report on *haydamaky* incursions, dating from 1768, mention is made of Fedir Tymets', Timofey Balashev and Aleksander Solomenikov, merchants from New Russia, who at that time were on their way to Paliyevе Ozero.<sup>187</sup> Again, it is in connection with *haydamaky* incursions that the destruction of the house of an inhabitant of Smila, Shmul', is mentioned. Shmul' failed to pay the merchant of Yelizavetgrad, Kamenev, for some kettles.<sup>188</sup> We find numerous references to the export of salt from the Crimea to Poland. Sebastian Bondariv, a New Russia merchant, played an important part in this trade.<sup>189</sup>

Customs registers point to continuous exchange of goods between the St. Elizabeth fortress and other localities of the New Russia province as well as with the Left- and Right-Bank Ukraine. Places like Uman', Paliyevе Ozero, Smila, Zhornyshche, Brody, Berdychiv, Balta, Tetiiv are mentioned especially frequently in the registers.<sup>190</sup>

With a view towards developing trade relations with Turkey, the Crimea, and West Europe, the Russian government desired to increase the number of merchants in the New Russia province. To achieve this goal, the authorities used strict measures. In 1770 the Senate ordered forty merchants and four guild members sent to each of the two fortresses of Azov and Taganrog, as well as to the New Russia province. A subsidy of 150 rubles per person was assigned to them for the purpose of establishing a business.<sup>191</sup>

In 1764, Catherine II, not content with issuing appeals to Russian and foreign merchants desirous of establishing themselves in New Russia, permitted Jews to settle and to trade in that province. The question of allowing Jews to settle in

187 N. Kostomarov, "Materialy dlya istorii Koliivshchiny..." *op. cit.*, p. 312.

188 Collection of N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko.

189 *PSZ*, No. 12769, October 27, 1766.

190 *Fond krip. sv. Yelysav.*, Nos. 153, 154, 156.

191 *PSZ*, No. 13518, September 23, 1770.

Russia was on the agenda of the Senate session at the time of Catherine II's first visit to its meetings. For convenience, this point was removed from the agenda and its discussion adjourned "until a more convenient time." Unofficially, however, Catherine solved the question in the affirmative. In a secret letter, dispatched at the beginning of 1764, Catherine vaguely intimated to Browne (Broun), Governor General of Livonia, that Jews were authorized to stay and trade in the New Russia province. The letter bears a remark written in Catherine's own hand: "If you don't understand me, it is not my fault."<sup>192</sup> As a consequence of this permission, the Jewish merchants David and Leo Bamberger "with associates" were enrolled among the New Russia merchants. On May 2, 1764 they signed a contract, by which they undertook to buy all the rhubarb in the state's possession. The commander in chief of the New Russia province, A. P. Mel'gunov, acted as guarantor in this affair.<sup>193</sup> This unofficial permission brought no visible results in the next several years. It was not until 1775 that a considerable number of Jewish colonists, mainly from Lithuania, reached the New Russia province. They were settled in the Yelizavetgrad district.<sup>194</sup>

Russians and Ukrainians furnished the bulk of merchants in the period under discussion. This is seen from Table 14,

<sup>192</sup> Yu. I. Gessen, *Zakon i zhizn'* [Law and life], St. Petersburg 1911, pp. 16-17.

<sup>193</sup> *Senatskii arkhiv*, XIV, 247.

<sup>194</sup> S. Stanislavski, "K istorii kolonizatsii Yevreyev v Novorossii" [On the History of the Colonization of Jews in New Russia], *Voskhod* [Dawn], 1887, Book 9, pp. 116-122; Stanislavski, "K istorii kolonizatsii" [On the History of Colonization], *Sbornik statei yekaterinoslavskogo nauchnogo obshchestva* [Collection of Articles of the Scientific Society of Ekaterinoslav], 1904, p. 239; P. A. Ivanov, "Delo o vykhodyashchikh iz zagranitsy v novorossiiskuyu guberniyu Zhidakh" [Affair of the Jews Originating from Beyond the Borders of the New Russia Province], *Zapiski odessk. ob-va istorii i drevnostei*, XVII, 163; N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Pershi kroky yevreys'koi kolonizatsii v pivdenniy Ukraini" [First Traces of Jewish Colonization in Southern Ukraine], *Zbirnyk prats' yevreys'koi istorychno-arkheografichnoi komisii* [Collection of Proceedings of the Jewish Historico-archeographical Commission], vol. II, Kiev 1929, *passim*.



which was compiled on the basis of A. Skal'kovski's data for the year 1778.<sup>195</sup>

TABLE 14  
DATA ON MERCHANTS

Nationality	Merchants	Guild Members	Total	Percentage of Total Number
1. Russians				64.0
a) Orthodox	359	65	424	1,960
b) Old Believers	766	770	1,536	
2. Ukrainians	390	345	735	24.1
3. Moldavians and Vlaks	136	37	173	5.6
4. Greeks	65	4	69	2.3
5. Bulgarians	83	5	88	2.9
6. Serbians	13	6	19	0.6
7. Hungarians	8	9	17	0.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,820</b>	<b>1,241</b>	<b>3,061</b>	<b>100.</b>

This table enables us to form an approximate idea of the national composition of New Russia's merchant and guild groups toward the end of the period under discussion. Its data tally with the information derived from a survey of merchant names. Unfortunately, in the majority of cases we lack evidence as to the settlers' original homes. Only in isolated instances do we find records of merchants migrating to New Russia. Thus, we meet settlers from Bryansk (Yegor Loskutov and others), Moscov (Yarilov), Putivl' (Maksimov, Pushkarev), Bolkhov (Aleksei and Mikhail Zakharov, Pavlov), Mtsensk (Parshev, Fursov), Odoyev (Aleksei and Afanasi Kurdyumov, Grigoriyev), Kaluga (Palkin), Ryl'sk (Fizhin), etc.<sup>196</sup>

<sup>195</sup> Sakal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 274-275.

<sup>196</sup> *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 69; *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 86, No. 2077; file 85, No. 1993; file 65, Nos. 1489, 1490; file 66, No. 1497; file 65, Nos. 1487, 1488; file 67, No. 1556.

These data point to the fact that representatives of Russian commercial capital moved into the New Russia province much more rapidly and in larger numbers than did the Russian landlords. While local officers, to a large extent of foreign extraction, prevail among the landowners, Russians take a decisive lead among the province's merchant class.

Among the merchants, a group of fairly prosperous businessmen stand out. They concentrated state contracts and leases in their hands. The Yelizavetgrad merchants Krasnoglazov and Andrei Sushilin were among the most prominent members of this inner circle.<sup>197</sup> In the list of lease holders drawn up in 1765 we find Mikhail Belezliy, later a deputy to the Commission of 1767, who took Novomyrhorod's taverns on lease for 355 rubles; Yegor Loskutov, who rented taverns in Fedvar and Tsybuliv for 220 and 290 rubles respectively; the merchant Yosifov, who rented Novoarkhangel's'k's taverns for 270 rubles.<sup>198</sup> Rents paid by other merchants were somewhat lower.

Merchants also invested in industrial enterprises. The merchant Maslennikov started a sugar factory in Kremenchuk;<sup>199</sup> there was a paper mill in Yelizavetgrad, and a tannery belonging to Manuyl Popovich, not to speak of a large number of mills of various types: wind mills, water mills, "boat mills" (*ladeini*), owned by various merchants, and of sheep, horse and cattle ranches.<sup>200</sup>

## VI. SOME CONCLUSIONS ON COLONIZATION

It is extremely difficult to obtain figures on the colonization of the New Russia province. Eighteenth century statistics were so imperfect that it is impossible to rely upon them. Reports composed at the same time often contradict one an-

197 *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 193; Collection of N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko.

198 *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 62, No. 1458, sheet 100.

199 F. Nikolaichik, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

200 *Arkhiv krip. sv. Yelysav.*, No. 64.

other. Nevertheless, these data can be evaluated, if one uses them with caution and attributes to them only approximate value.

The most precise report was drawn up in 1772. It is entitled "Report, Made in the New Russia Provincial Chancery on the Basis of Reports Sent by the Hussar and Lancer Regiments in the Jurisdiction of the Catherine and Yelizavetgrad Districts and Bakhmut City Chanceries for the May Trimester of the Past Year of 1772." Unfortunately, it is preserved only in a very bad copy.<sup>201</sup>

The copy contains no information on its original, but A. Skal'kovski, whose figures on the population of the Catherine district completely coincide with those given in the copy, says that he has derived his data from the Archives of the New Russia expedition of the Governor General of Kiev.<sup>202</sup>

The Report has been mechanically compiled from regional reports coming from various parts of the province. As the regional reports follow different methods for arranging their data, the consolidated Report lacks uniformity. In the Yelizavetgrad and Catherine districts military servicemen and their substitutes were entered separately from their families. In the Bakhmut and Luban' regiments, these two categories were lumped together, so that a category of military servicemen of female sex was invented. Certain reports contain figures for the *familiyaty* while others omit them. In the Catherine district and the Bakhmut county we find not only data on the population of the regiments, but also other population figures without any specification of the territory to which the people accounted for belong.

The data of the Report have been broken up into four tables (15, 16, 17 and 18).

<sup>201</sup> Odessk. istor. muzei, *Zbirka...*, II-31-65, pp. 104-06.

<sup>202</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 91. The difference is that Skal'kovski dates it 1773.

TABLE 15  
POPULATION OF THE YELIZAVETGRAD DISTRICT  
1772

	Black Hussar Regiment		Yellow Hussar Regiment		Moldavian Hussar Regiment		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Servicemen and Their Families	2199	—	1506	—	2124	—	2124
Substitutes, Ascribed, <i>Familiyaty</i>	4278	4819	2814	3074	12443	5268	17711
Their Families	651	—	336	—	544	—	544
People Living with Servicemen As <i>Duorovi Lyudy</i>	1064	1371	471	585	1584	1060	2644
Their Families	950	875	530	—	—	—	—
Laborers, with Families, Providing Their Own Livelihood	—	—	962	1196	—	—	—
Staff and Company Officers, Retired	75	83	—	—	—	—	—
Retired Non-Commissioned Officers, Corporals and Rank-and-File Soldiers	78	86	51	54	—	—	—
State Peasants	79	63	128	110	—	—	—
Landlord Peasants	405	417	1323	1322	—	—	—
	6668	6618	5093	4807	95	141	236
<b>Total</b>	<b>16447</b>	<b>14332</b>	<b>13214</b>	<b>11148</b>	<b>16790</b>	<b>6469</b>	<b>23259</b>

TABLE 15

	Yelizavetgrad Regiment		St. Elizabeth Fortress County		T o t a l s			% of Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Totals	Male		Female	Total
Servicemen and Their Families	1135	—	1135	—	—	—	6964	—	6964	6.5
Substitutes, Ascribed, <i>Familyaty</i>	1797	2182	3979	—	—	—	21332	15343	36675	34.0
Their Families	2844	—	2844	—	—	—	4375	—	4375	4.1
People Living with Servicemen As <i>Dvorout Lyudy</i>	3293	5887	9180	—	—	—	6412	8903	15315	14.2
Their Families	—	—	—	—	—	—	1480	875	2355	2.2
Laborers, with Families, Providing Their Own Livelihood	—	—	—	—	—	—	962	1196	2158	2.0
Staff and Company Officers, Retired	44	52	96	—	—	—	75	83	158	0.1
Retired Non-Commissioned Officers, Corporals and Rank-and-File Soldiers	11	10	21	34	29	63	252	212	464	0.4
State Peasants	40	34	74	5892	4482	10374	7660	6255	13915	13.0
Landlord Peasants	416	474	890	342	330	672	12614	12370	24984	23.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>9580</b>	<b>8639</b>	<b>18219</b>	<b>6268</b>	<b>4841</b>	<b>11109</b>	<b>62299</b>	<b>45429</b>	<b>107728</b>	<b>100.</b>

TABLE 16  
POPULATION OF CATHERINE DISTRICT

	Donets Lancer Regiment			Dnepr Lancer Regiment	
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Servicemen	765	—	765	1368	—
Their Families	1179	1444	2623	11712	12454
Substitutes, Ascribed, <i>Familiyaty</i>	1437	—	1437	—	—
Their Families	2058	3061	5119	—	—
Staff and Company Officers, Retired	5	10	15	—	—
Retired Non-Commissioned Officers, Corporals, and Rank-and-File Soldiers	—	—	—	—	—
State Peasants	8540	8634	17174	4832	4855
Landlord Peasants	2345	2147	4492	—	—
Freeholders	—	—	—	—	—
Total	16329	15296	31625	17912	17309

TABLE 17  
POPULATION OF BAKHMUT COUNTY

	Bakhmut Town and County			Bakhmut Government Regiment		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Servicemen	—	—	—	3289	—	3289
Their Families	—	—	—	—	2500	2500
Substitutes, Ascribed, <i>Familiyaty</i>	—	—	—	1309	—	1309
Their Families	—	—	—	—	1330	1330
People Living with Servicemen	—	—	—	—	—	—
As <i>Dvorovi Lyudy</i>	—	—	—	236	249	485
State Peasants	4484	4097	8581	157	95	252
Landlord Peasants	4390	3814	8204	2641	2060	4701
Freeholders	5180	4073	9253	—	—	—
Salts	584	275	859	—	—	—
Total	14638	12259	26897	7632	6234	13866

Catherine District			T o t a l s				
Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	% of Total
1368	—	—	—	2133	—	2133	2.3
24166	—	—	—	12891	13898	26789	29.4
—	—	—	—	1437	—	1437	1.6
—	—	—	—	2058	3061	5119	5.6
—	6	12	18	11	22	33	0.1
—	199	258	457	199	258	457	0.5
9687	—	—	—	13372	13489	26861	29.5
—	—	—	—	2345	2147	4492	4.9
—	11837	11993	23830	11837	11993	23830	26.1
35221	12042	12263	24305	46283	44868	91151	100

Samara Hussar Regiment			Luhan' Regiment			T o t a l			
Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	% of Total
—	—	—	278	—	278	3567	—	3567	8.3
—	—	—	393	625	1018	393	3125	3518	8.2
—	—	—	6	—	6	1315	—	1315	3.1
—	—	—	11	16	27	11	1346	1357	3.2
—	—	—	—	—	—	236	249	485	1.1
—	—	—	411	449	860	5052	4641	9693	22.5
14	15	29	20	6	26	7065	5895	12960	30.1
—	—	—	—	—	—	5180	4073	9253	21.5
—	—	—	—	—	—	584	275	859	2.0
14	15	29	1119	1096	2215	23403	19604	43007	100

TABLE 18

## POPULATION OF NEW RUSSIA PROVINCE

	Yelizavetgrad District			Catherine District	
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Servicemen	6964	—	6964	2133	—
Their Families	21332	15343	36675	12891	13898
Substitutes, Ascribed, <i>Familiyaty</i>	4375	—	4375	1437	—
Their Families	6412	8903	15315	2058	3061
People Living with Servicemen As <i>Dvorovi Lyudy</i>	1480	875	2355	—	—
Their Families	962	1196	2158	—	—
Laborers with Families, Providing Their Own Livelihood	75	83	158	—	—
Staff and Company Officers, Retired	173	192	365	11	22
Retired Non-Commissioned Officers, Corporals, and Rank-and-File Soldiers	252	212	464	199	258
State Peasants	7660	6255	13915	13372	13489
Landlord Peasants	12614	12370	24984	2345	2147
Freeholders	—	—	—	11837	11993
Salters	—	—	—	—	—
Total	62299	45429	107728	46283	44868

The population of the New Russia province amounted to 241,886 persons, 131,985 male and 109,901 female. It was unevenly distributed within the districts of the province. There were 107,728 persons in Yelizavetgrad district, 91,151 persons in Catherine district, and 43,007 persons in Bakhmut county.

The distribution of population among the regiments was also uneven. In the Yelizavetgrad district, we meet the highest population figures in the Black Hussar and Yellow Hussar regiments (30,779 and 24,362 persons respectively). This is quite understandable since these regiments inherited the territory of the oldest regiments of Nova Serbiya. The reason



Bakhmut County			Total				
Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	% of Total
2133	3567	—	3567	12664	—	12664	5.2
26789	393	3125	3519	34616	32566	66982	27.7
1437	1315	—	1315	7127	—	7127	3.0
5119	11	1346	1357	8481	13310	21791	9.0
—	236	249	485	1716	1124	2840	1.2
—	—	—	—	962	1196	2158	0.9
—	—	—	—	75	83	158	0.1
33	—	—	—	184	214	398	0.1
457	—	—	—	451	270	921	0.4
26861	5052	4641	9693	26084	24385	50469	20.8
4492	7065	5895	12960	22024	20412	42436	17.6
23830	5180	4073	9253	17017	16066	33083	13.7
—	584	275	859	584	275	859	0.3
91151	23403	19604	43007	131985	109901	241886	100

for the large number of settlers in the Moldavian Hussar regiment (23,259 persons) is less clear, since this unit was formed late and its territory was the last to be colonized. Generally speaking, population figures for this regiment sound doubtful. As compared with 2,124 servicemen, the number of the members of their families, their substitutes, the latter's *familiyaty* and their families amounts to 20,899 persons (14,571 male and 6,328 female), which gives a ratio of nine persons for each serviceman. We do not meet with a similar ratio anywhere else.

The population of the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment was

considerably smaller (18,219 persons). It is interesting to compare the data for this regiment with the population figures for the Slobids'kyi regiment, which was its predecessor. In 1765, the Slobids'kyi regiment had 23,668 inhabitants, including 9,468 servicemen, 100 clergymen and 277 members of their families, 200 retired servicemen and 333 members of their families, 1,270 state peasants, both male and female, and 1,168 landlord peasants. At first sight it seems that the population had diminished, but one should remember that a part of the Slobids'kyi regiment territory was incorporated into the Moldavian regiment.

Our data for the Catherine district are even more incomplete and vague. Only the figures for the Donets and Dnepr regiments (31,625 and 35,221 persons respectively) have a semblance of probability. Moreover, population groups not belonging to the regiments were accounted for. These comprised freeholders, retired officers and soldiers who were exempt from taxation.

In addition to the figures for the Bakhmut, Luhan' and Samara regiments, the Bakhmut county report lists the population of the town of Bakhmut; however, since only freeholders and salters are included in the latter group (55 and 859 persons respectively), they have been included into the population of the Bakhmut County. There is no reason to doubt the figures given for the population of the Bakhmut and the Luhan' regiments. On the other hand, the number of the landlords' peasants living in the Samara regiment (twenty-nine for the whole territory) is so strikingly small that an error must be supposed in the report.

In summing up the data of the consolidated Report we may say that servicemen constituted the chief single category of the province's population. In the Yelizavetgrad district, active and retired soldiers and their men made up 61 per cent, in the Catherine district 39.5 per cent, and in the Bakhmut county 23.9 per cent of the population. The percentage for the whole province was 47.6. State peasants amounted to 20.8

per cent and, together with the freeholders, 41.3 per cent of the government's inhabitants.

The category of "outside laborers, with families, who provide for their own livelihood" remains unclear. In any case, their number was quite small (0.1 per cent of the population). Salters working in Bakhmut salt works were considered a separate group (only 0.3 per cent of the population). The social status of these people varied; there were "ascribed" persons as well as free persons among them.

In this period the number of the landlords' peasants was not yet considerable, amounting to 17.6 per cent of the New Russia province's population. The Yelizavetgrad district had most of them (30.1 per cent of its population) and the Catherine district the least (4.9 per cent).

It should be kept in mind that the Report gives no figures for clergymen, merchants, and the nobility. Thus the total population of the government must have been higher than that stipulated by the Report.

It is difficult to pass judgment on the reliability of the data contained in the Report. We can only compare them with the information compiled by A. Skal'kovski. This information is presented in the following table.

TABLE 19  
POPULATION OF THE NEW RUSSIA PROVINCE

Area	1768 <sup>203</sup>		1773 <sup>204</sup>		1774 <sup>205</sup>		
	Male	Male	Female	Both Sexes	Male	Female	Both Sexes
Yelizavetgrad	19,639	22,215	19,870	42,085	30,733	23,646	54,379
Catherine	12,753	27,827	27,953	55,780	23,645	24,294	47,939
Bakhmut County	19,627	13,751	12,112	25,863	27,827	27,953	55,780
TOTAL	52,019	63,793	59,935	123,728	82,205	75,893	158,098

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 76, (does not include the nobility, clergy, military servicemen, clerks).

<sup>204</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 90.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96.

The difference between the figures given in the Report of 1772 and those of Table 19 is striking. While the former evaluates the total population of the province at 241,886, according to the latter only 123,728 persons lived in New Russia in 1773. The difference is to be explained by the fact that Skal'kovski's statistics omit certain categories of inhabitants, in particular all types of servicemen. If the figures for these servicemen, both active and discharged (114,881, according to the Report of 1772), are added to Skal'kovski's data, and 238,609 is obtained as the total population of the Report of 1772.

In the Appendix to his "Chronological Survey" (*khronologicheskoye obozreniye*), Skal'kovski publishes an interesting report under the title "Report on the Number and Nationality of Merchants, Craftsmen, State and Landlords' Peasants, Active and Retired Rank Holders of Either Sex." It was drawn up in 1773 in the New Russia Provincial Chancery at Kremenchuk for the Yelizavetgrad and Catherine districts, excluding Bakhmut county.<sup>206</sup> The content of the Report does not coincide with the information quoted above, since merchants, craftsmen, rank holders, state and landlords' peasants are listed here. The total population figure for the Yelizavetgrad district is 58,719 (30,733 male and 27,986 female), and for the Catherine district 47,939 (23,645 male and 24,294 female).

If one compares individual items of these reports, one finds that the differences between them are not very significant. Let us take the state peasants as an example. The figures for the Yelizavetgrad district are 13,915 (Report of 1772) and 15,824 (Report of 1773) persons of both sex. For the Catherine district, we have 26,861 and 24,071 persons of both sex. For the category of landlords' peasants, the figures are 24,984 and 35,400 (the Yelizavetgrad district) and 4,792 and 22,056 persons (the Catherine district). In this case, the discrepancies in the data for the Catherine district are great.

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 275.

Another detailed statistical report was drawn up in 1786. Its purpose was to show the success of the colonizing activity and the increase in the region's revenues during Potemkin's twelve-year administration.<sup>207</sup> Population figures for the year 1774 were taken as the starting point of this report. The very purpose of the report is a sufficient guaranty that the 1774 figures could not have been exaggerated; on the contrary, there is reason to assume that they were deliberately kept low. The report is concerned with the region's male population only.

TABLE 20

## POPULATION OF THE NEW RUSSIA PROVINCE IN 1774

Merchants	1,692
Craftsmen	1,054
State Peasants	14,064
Freeholders and their Peasants	14,952
Township Peasants	654
Landlords' Settlers	38,453
Landlords' Peasants	236
Salters	685
Old Believers coming from Poland	261
People exempt from taxation	
a) substitutes in the Hussar regiments	2,115
b) Their " <i>familiyaty</i> "	18,685
c) People attached to the Lancer regiments with their " <i>familiyaty</i> "	14,157
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>107,008</b>

<sup>207</sup> *Moskovski otdel obshchego arkhiva glavnogo shtaba*, list 194, file 295, No. 12.

It is difficult to compare the above figures with those of the Report of 1772, since, with a few exceptions, they list different categories of population. The list of 1774 omits servicemen and gives information only on their substitutes and the *familiyaty*, while the Report of 1772 has no entries for merchants or craftsmen. But the total figure of the above report (107,008 male population) does not differ much from that of the Report of 1772 (131,985 men) and takes an intermediate position between it and Skal'kovski's data for 1774 (82,205 men).

Such are the total figures, however vague and inexact, for the region's population. It should be borne in mind that the general situation there was always tense and uneasy. The New Russia province, stretching far to the south, was constantly exposed to dangers unknown to the Left-Bank Ukraine. Naturally enough, this circumstances made conditions of life there rather hard and proved an obstacle to colonization.

Tatar raids were among the principal obstacles of this kind. True enough, in the second half of the eighteenth century they were not so disastrous as they had been in the seventeenth. Nevertheless, the life of the region, especially in its eastern part, was so organized as to take into account the constant threat of Tatar incursions. The "Ukrainian" and "Dnepr Lines" (built to ward off the Tatars), regimental settlements, outposts—all this daily reminded the population of the impending danger of a debacle. The last Tatar raid, launched in 1769, covered a vast area. This time, Tatar action acquired special significance, since the khan appeared as a vassal of Turkey. The Tatars overran the New Russia province with a huge army in severe winter weather. Baron de Tott, the French resident at the Crimean court, who accompanied the Tatar army on its expedition, left a detailed account of the raid.<sup>208</sup>

<sup>208</sup> In *Kiyevskaya starina*, VII, 1883, 145-198; A. Tatarchevski, "Puteshestviye i deyatel'nost' barona Totta v kachestve konsula v Krymu v 1767 g." [Journey and Activities as Consul in the Crimea in 1767 of Baron Tott] *Izvestiya kiyevskogo universiteta* [News of the University of Kiev] Vol. XIII, October 1873, Part 2, *passim*.

The Tatars came as far as Yelizavetgrad, burning villages and supplies, and took cattle and people with them. They advanced in the glare of fires; people abandoned their homes and sought refuge in woods wherever it was possible. Tott left a gloomy description of the destruction of the settlement of Adzhamka and Tsybuliv. The whole population fled from the settlement of Zelena, Deriivka was also abandoned, so that in 1771 it had fewer inhabitants than in 1768.<sup>209</sup> The outposts of Fedvar and Subotytsya were completely destroyed.<sup>210</sup> According to Tott's account, fifty settlements were burned down in the Yelizavetgrad province alone.<sup>211</sup>

The spirit of the population is well reflected in the report which Second Major Maksimov submitted to the authorities immediately after the incursion, on January 26, 1769. The inhabitants of Honchars'ka and of eight other settlements, Maksimov wrote, fled to the forest with their wives and children. The enemy entered the settlement on January 24 and burned it down. The report continues:

When the enemy entered the settlement, since the number of the Tatars was small at first, the inhabitants of Honchars'ka and other settlements, who had been hiding in forests, left them with their firearms to fire on the enemy and resist with other weapons. Some enemy soldiers were killed; the settlement inhabitants also suffered losses in dead and wounded. All our wounded are safe. It is impossible to establish the number of the dead, since many settlement inhabitants are still hiding in forests, and the enemy usually burns his dead.<sup>212</sup>

Not only settlement inhabitants, but also servicemen were seized with such fear that a number of them abandoned their settlements and fled to the better fortified places of New Russia or even deep into the territory of the Ukraine. The development and increase in population during this period of

<sup>209</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, I, 229.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 192.

<sup>211</sup> See *Kiyevskaya starina*, VII, 1883, 168-72.

<sup>212</sup> Odessk. istor. muzei, *Zbirka...*, II, 31-65; Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, 14-18.

such settlements as Borodaïvka and Polovytsi was due to the influx of refugees from the Yelizavetgrad province, fleeing the Tatar incursion.<sup>213</sup> The majority of refugees, however, left New Russia altogether. The Yelizavetgrad district chancery reported to Chertkov in February, 1769, that many settlements were abandoned as their inhabitants took refuge in fortified places and "in Little Russia." Consequently, quite a number of companies of Hussar and Lancer regiments were without soldiers and even commanders. For that reason it was difficult to evaluate the losses in men and property caused by the raid. The chancery instructed the regiments to send out "reliable persons" to inspect their districts and find out how many people remained in the villages, how many houses and provisions, such as grain and hay, had been destroyed, and finally what losses had been suffered by the merchants of the St. Elizabeth suburb. The ruin was so complete that Voyeikov submitted the project of a sweeping reorganization of the district; he proposed to transfer the population of the southern parts to the northern villages.

A census was ordered with a view towards implementing this project and the picture obtained was discouraging. Although nominal strength of a Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment company was 200 men, the actual strength scarcely amounted to 50 per cent of that figure. In Orlyanka, 18 men remained, in Adzhamka, 19, in Dobryanka, 21, in Popel'nyasta, 26; only the Murzynka company had as many as 112 men. Only 429 households remained in the settlements of six companies. Thus it was easy to resettle the inhabitants of fifteen companies on the territory of five, namely, those of Domoțkan', Borodaïvka, Troynyt's'ke, Kamyanka, and Myshuryñ Rih, where the census showed a total figure of 335 inhabitants. The Black and Yellow Hussar Regiments were also undermanned.<sup>214</sup> According to the project, company settlements were to be

<sup>213</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, I, 41, 217; *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 76, No. 1666, sheet 401.

<sup>214</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 76, No. 1666, pp. 392-396.



fortified. A covered dugout was to be made in each homestead, to provide shelter in case of a raid. Each settlement was to have the shape of an equilateral triangle, enclosed with a ditch and provided with redoubts opposite the gates.<sup>215</sup> All these plans remained on paper and, as soon as things quieted down, the population began spontaneously to return to the settlements.<sup>216</sup>

That this homecoming was a slow process may be inferred from an interesting memorandum submitted by the New Russia province to the Kiev provincial chancery. The New Russia Provincial Chancery made known that during the enemy raid, which ravaged the Yelizavetgrad, the Catherine districts and the Bakhmut county in 1769, "inhabitants of various social levels, including hussars, lancers, and peasants ascribed to them were stricken by fear and fled to Little Russia, the Slobids'ka provinces, Great Russian localities, and the Valuyka steppe. Many of these refugees have not yet returned to their abodes." Their absence, the memorandum went on, made it difficult for those who had remained to fulfil their duties, such as the providing of transportation and the delivering of forage. Therefore Count Panin, the commander of the army, ordered their immediate return to the New Russia province.<sup>217</sup> The shock suffered by the province must have been violent indeed, if its inhabitants were rolled back as far as the steppe of Valuyka.

Although the Catherine district also suffered from the Tatar raid, its losses were much less grave. Among others, the settlements of Pidhirna (on the Kil'chen' River), Rudivka or Mykolaïvka were destroyed. The inhabitants of this last settlement took refuge in the Samara monastery.<sup>218</sup>

The Tatar incursion of 1769 was but one episode in a difficult and prolonged war with Turkey. In this war, the New Russia

<sup>215</sup> *Ibid.*, No. 1666, pp. 399-419.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, file 75, No. 1607.

<sup>217</sup> *Fond kiyevskoi gub. kantsel.*, No. 4326.

<sup>218</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, I, 12, 524.

province had to pay an exceptionally heavy toll in human lives and material goods. Not only were regiments formed from its inhabitants, but the remaining population also had to provide the passing Russian armies with food, billets, forage, transportation, labor for all kinds of earth works, etc. For people who had not yet had the time to take root and to develop their newly established households, this was a heavy burden indeed. The authorities themselves were aware of the situation. In his letter of 1774, Chertkov explained to Potemkin why New Russia was not able to fulfill its duties and enumerated all the many burdens which the war imposed on the population.<sup>219</sup> As early as 1771 the Council of State ordered that higher prices be paid for horses and oxen furnished by New Russia, in view of "the exhausted state of the population of the Yelizavetgrad and Catherine districts."<sup>220</sup>

The war left one more terrible scar in the New Russia province, namely, the plague, which was euphemistically referred to in official correspondence as "the dangerous disease." It spread over the Yelizavetgrad province in 1773, in spite of all the measures, such as quarantines, fumigation, and the like, by which eighteenth century medicine could oppose its advance.

Such were the external causes which slowed down the colonization of the region, despite the wealth of its natural resources and governmental efforts. But causes of internal character were much more important. They were deeply rooted in eighteenth century Russia's social order and prevented any considerable improvement in the status of peasants no matter to what category the latter might belong.

Juridically speaking, there still was no serfdom in the New Russia province. Peasants' duties towards the landlord were limited to one or two days of service a week. This period is mentioned in the inquiry sent by the government chancery to Voyeikov; Gldenstdt, too, gives the same information.<sup>221</sup> The

<sup>219</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronol. obozr.*, I, 113-114.

<sup>220</sup> *Arkhiv gosudarstvennogo soveta*, I, Part I, 77.

<sup>221</sup> Bagalei, ed., "Puteshestviye akademika Gil'denshtedta," *op. cit.*, p. 134.

landlords, however, were not satisfied with this state of things and did their best to increase the peasants' burdens.

In this context it is interesting to quote the "Opinion" of Major Kozel's'ki on taxes to be paid by peasants to their landlords. Kozel's'ki, a deputy of the nobility of the Catherine district, submitted his views to the Commission of 1767, convened to draw up a code of laws. Kozel's'ki proposed that two days of socage a week be introduced everywhere in the government. If local conditions should so require, this obligation could be replaced by a contribution in money equal to the peasant's daily earnings. In this latter point, Kozel's'ki's proposal seems to have reflected the customary law prevailing in the province. But other articles of the proposal contain new features: while granting to the peasants free use of both their movable and their immovable property, Kozel's'ki wanted to restrict their right to sell or mortgage the latter. It appears from this declaration that by 1767 the position of landlords' peasants was more favorable in New Russia than in the Left-Bank Ukraine, where peasants wanting to move on had been deprived of the right of free disposal of their property by the Proclamation of 1761. Moreover, the right to leave the landlord's estate depended upon the latter's consent.

In instructions issued to their representatives, the landlords devoted much space to their relations with the peasants. The nobility of Bakhmut county were especially meticulous in this respect. They referred to the decrees of the Slobids'ka provincial chancery, by which "free Little Russians were forbidden to change their abodes in Her Imperial Majesty's interest, as well as their own, so that no one might change his domicile without proper documents." Nevertheless, peasants continued to move from one place to another and were gladly received not only by landlords, but also by the administrators of state settlements. Therefore, the nobility asked that the practice of receiving peasants be forbidden, and those continuing to do so be punished for giving shelter to fugitives.<sup>222</sup> The status of the serfs caus-

<sup>222</sup> *Sbornik IRIO*, XCIII, 74-78, 87-89.

ed even more trouble to the Bakhmut nobility. They complained that cases of elopement and marriage of female serfs with officials and private individuals, and especially with military men, were multiplying. Since these unmarried serfs (*devki*) had been taught some useful trade at their masters' expense, their flight caused considerable loss to the landlords. Therefore the nobles asked that a special law, defending their rights to control female serfs, both married and unmarried, be promulgated. The law should prohibit marriages without the landlords' permission; those guilty of marriage with a fugitive serf could be fined or flogged at the discretion of the owner of the serf girl.

The nobility was dissatisfied with the leniency of laws regulating their relations with peasants. Because of this leniency, nobles could not live peacefully, since "people contaminated with bad consciences not only have their fill of theft, pillage and robbery, but in some cases also kill their masters." Seeing this "and remembering that other landlords, their equals, had been murdered by such people," the nobles lived in constant fear. Even if a culprit were caught, he could hope for pardon only if he confessed his guilt sincerely. At worst, the nobles maintained, he would be deported to forced labor at Kerchinsk or Rogervik and would suffer no torture. As a convict, he would work in conditions to which he was accustomed since childhood and even be paid for his labors. No wonder, then, that peasants "do not show any fear" in anticipation of such punishment. Moreover, the nobles wrote, many such criminals found refuge among the Zaporozhian and Don Cossacks. Therefore the Bakhmut nobles asked that tortures and capital punishment be reintroduced for thieves, robbers, and murderers "to deter bad and protect good people." The sentences would be executed by provincial and district chanceries.<sup>223</sup> Georgian nobles of the Donets Lancer regiment also bemoaned the desertions of "subjects donated to them." The subjects had dispersed "not so much because of oppression as on account of the freedom to go from one place

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 38-40.

to another." Georgian princes were especially vexed by the fact that their "subjects" did not go to far-away places but often crossed the street and settled on officers' possessions. The nobles asked that such passportless subjects be no longer received, since "there already existed orders concerning such prohibition," and persons violating these orders, be heavily fined.<sup>224</sup>

Instructions of the nobility of the Yelizavetgrad district made no mention of measures restricting admission of peasants. This was natural, since at that time the welfare of these landlords was based on the unimpaired influx of all persons willing to settle on their estates.<sup>225</sup>

It appears from this fragmentary information which found its way into the instructions for the deputies that serfdom was being introduced in New Russia at a rapid pace and that, in some places, struggles occurred between peasants and landlords. But the general conditions of life, the scarcity of manpower and the desire of the landlords to colonize their estates as quickly as possible in order to secure their possessions, prevented any further increase of peasants' burdens. The peasants were always free to depart, either to the estates of the neighboring landlords, who would gladly receive and protect them, or to Zaporizhzhya. It is even conceivable that life was more peaceful in the landlords' villages than in the state or military settlements at that time.

Oppression and exploitation by authorities were made even more difficult to bear by the constant struggle with the Zaporozhian Cossacks, who were overrunning the settlements, ruining homesteads and rustling cattle. Maksym Morenets', a deputy of the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment, drew a gloomy picture of the life of the servicemen of the province in his letter to Belezlii, who represented the St. Elizabeth fortress. "In their bereavement," Morenets' wrote that the servicemen lived from trading in salt, brandy, fish, tar, tobacco, rope, lambskins, wool, etc. Should they be prohibited from continuing this trade, they

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 74-78.

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 38-40.

would not even be able to fulfill their military duties. Morenets' opinion was supported by Moroz, a deputy for the settlers of the various regiments of the Yelizavetgrad district. He declared that "if the Hussars and the Little Russian people are prohibited from trading, they will be left with no means of support."<sup>226</sup>

This situation of the Cossacks took a turn for the worse in 1764, the date of the general reorganization of the region. According to A. P. Mel'gunov's project, Cossack regiments were to be transformed into Lancer units. The officers of these regiments were immediately to obtain officers' ranks equal to the corresponding grade of officers in the regular army regiments, while Cossacks were to enroll as Lancers "at their own request." Four such regiments were to be formed, namely the Yelizavetgrad, to replace the Slobids'kyi regiment of the Yelizavetgrad district, the Luhan', the Dnepr and the Donets regiments in the left bank region of the province.<sup>227</sup> The very fact of the organization of the regiments alarmed those settlers who had remained in the same settlements but who had been transferred from the administration of these regiments to the administration of New Russia. A large number of people of all walks of life showed dissatisfaction with the "uniform law" of the government which came to replace the former Cossack order. The Dnepr regiment, commanded by Alymov, was formed first. Enrollment was open to all; members of the officers' corp were promised officers' ranks, and ordinary Lancers, land allotments according to the "Colonization Plan," i.e., amounting to thirty *desyatiny* each. *Pidpomishnyky*, tenants, *pospolyti*, and landlords' subjects enrolled gladly, the latter especially so, since upon enrolling they were relieved of all duties towards their masters. However, the bulk of Cossacks resisted the "Lancer recruitment."<sup>228</sup> Alymov and his aide, Synehub, an army comrade (*viys'kovyi tovarysh*) who obtained the rank of cavalry captain, had to resort to violent measures in order to force the inhabitants of the newly incorp-

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 116 ff.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, VIII, 133-34.

<sup>228</sup> See: Miller, "Pikineriya," *op. cit.* 301-302.

orated companies to enter the Lancer regiments. The indignation caused by the recruitment is clearly reflected in *Istoriya Rusov* and in the popular tradition concerning Alymov's, Mel'gunov's and Synehub's activities.<sup>220</sup> These men sought to sway some people by promises of land allotments; they intimidated others by threatening them with confiscation of their land should they persist in refusing to join the Lancers.

Under such pressure and subject to severe punishments, persecution and the like, the inhabitants enrolled in the Lancer regiments, but their discontent with the new order of things continued to grow and was first expressed in 1767, during the elections of deputies to the Commission of 1767. Cossacks of the Kremenchuk and Vlasivka companies, transferred from the Myrhorod regiment to the New Russia province, refused to elect a representative with the Lancers of the Dnepr regiment, to which they now belonged. Instead, they secretly elected representatives of their own. Cossack Kochkonih was to be the spokesman of the Kremenchuk Cossacks, while flag comrade Denysiv was to represent Kremenchuk and Vlasivka. They were provided with instructions in due form, which mainly expressed the Cossacks' discontent with their role as Lancers and requested a return to their previous status. The Commission determined that the representatives had been elected irregularly. Denysiv was arrested, but succeeded in escaping to Zaporizhzhya; Kochkonih did not appear before the Commission at all.

This incident provides an important illustration of the Cossacks' hostile attitude towards the Lancers. Denysiv kept in touch with Lancer Morenets' and the peasant Moroz, deputies of the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment, who apparently sympathized with the wishes of the Cossacks of the Vlasivka and Kremenchuk companies.

<sup>220</sup> G. Koniskii, *Istoriya Rusov ili Maloi Rossii* [History of the People of Rus', or Little Russia], Moscow 1846, pp. 252-254; I. Manzhura, "Kartinka vvedeniya yekaterininskikh poryadkov v Zaporozhskom kraye" [A picture of the introduction of Catherine's regulations in the Zaporozhian area], *Yekaterinoslavskii yubileinyi listok* [Ekaterinoslav jubilee paper], Ekaterinoslav, 1887, pt. 2, pp. 11-12.

chuk companies.<sup>230</sup> About the same time, serious unrest broke out in the Keleberda company of the Dnepr Lancer regiment. The Cossacks petitioned Catherine II to return them to the jurisdiction of "Little Russia" and pointed out that they had been forcibly enrolled as Lancers by the *sotnyk* Floryns'kyi.<sup>231</sup> During the investigation of this affair, a throng assembled in Keleberda, shouted threats at the regiment's commander Odobash and forced him to go into hiding. It dispersed only after the arrival of a military unit.<sup>232</sup>

Lancers of the Yelizavetgrad regiment also showed discontent. The deputy Morenets' submitted a separate petition to Catherine concerning the reinstatement of the Cossack order and the abolition of the Lancer regiments. The official instruction (*nakaz*), his petition pointed out, was written by the commanders alone, without any participation of rank-and-file Lancers.<sup>233</sup> Thus the Lancer regiments were swept by a great wave of unrest in 1767. They put their hopes in the Commission through which they expected to obtain a betterment of their situation. But the Commission did not bring any tangible results. Denysiv, Morenets', and Moroz were excluded from the deputies and the Commission itself was soon dissolved.

But the commotion in the Lancer regiments did not come to an end. The revolutionary mood of the masses was strengthened in 1765 in connection with the movement known as *Koliivshchyna*. There existed two types of contact between the Left-Bank, Southern, and Right-Bank Ukraine. First, Cossacks and peasants from the Left-Bank, New Russia and especially Zaporizhzhya moved to the Right-Bank Ukraine. Arrivals from Zaporizhzhya played a very prominent part in the *haydamak* units. Both Rumyantsev and Voyeikov were quite embarrassed by the participation of Russian subjects in the

230 G. A. Maksimovich. *Vybory i nakazy v Malorossii* [Elections and Instructions in Little Russia], Kiev 1917, pp. 282-90.

231 A. Florovski, *Sostav zakonodatel'noi komissii*, pp. 79-81.

232 Huslysty, *Z istorii klasovoi borot'by v Stepoviy Ukraini*, p. 32.

233 *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.



movement. When, in the process of suppressing the uprising, the Smila province was affected by military operations, it was feared that the movement might be channeled into New Russia.<sup>234</sup> Second, since extremely harsh measures were used against the rebels, the population moved in increasing numbers from the Right-Bank Ukraine to New Russia and Zaporizhzhya. At the same time, those inhabitants of New Russia who had reasons to fear persecution and punishment for participation in the *Koliivshchyna*, moved to Zaporizhzhya.

The poor Cossacks' (*siroma*) uprising in Zaporizhzhya (1768) and the "Lancer Mutiny" in the New Russia province are closely connected with the *Koliivshchyna*. The "Lancer Mutiny" started at the very beginning of 1769 in the Tsarychanka company of the Donets Lancer regiment. The affair began with the refusal of the deputy from the Luhan', Dnepr and Donets regiments, to take part in the Turkish campaign. Tymchenko was supported by the whole battalion. There followed the mutiny of the Tsarychanka company which also refused to obey the orders of the authorities.<sup>235</sup> In October of the same year, a rebellion broke out in the Sokilka company of the Dnepr regiment. From there, it spread to the entire Dnepr regiment and affected the Donets regiment. Attempts to "talk sense" to the rebels were of no avail. The expedition of "Little Russian" units into the rebellious area proved risky, since in many cases the Cossacks went over to the Lancers. Large groups of Lancers, joined by Zaporozhian Cossacks, formed units of several hundred men each and troubled the whole region along the Orel.<sup>236</sup> Generally speaking, the rebellious Lancers found warm support among the Zaporozhian Cossacks.

In 1770, regular army units and Don Cossacks were sent against the Lancer insurgents. All Lancers who had joined the rebels

<sup>234</sup> "Perepiska grafa Rumyantseva o vosstanii na Ukraine" [Correspondence of Count Rumyantsev on the Revolt in the Ukraine], *Kiyevskaya starina*, IV, 1882, 112; VII, 1883, 269, 278.

<sup>235</sup> Huslysty, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-44, 47.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

were given a two-week term to "repent" and return. Cruel punishment awaited those who refused. Many of them died before the tortures were over. Their bodies were not buried, but "the treacherous carrion was dragged through all the settlements in observance of the order of His Serenity, the Count" (i. e., Panin). The survivors were sent to forced labor for life in Siberia.<sup>237</sup> Such was the end of the "Lancer Mutiny" of 1767-1770.

This is not the whole story of unrest in the Lancer regiments. Our information on this subject is abundant. We know, for instance, of disorders in the settlements of Murzynka (Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment). Our data on passive resistance are even more explicit. It expressed itself mainly in escapes to Zaporizhzhya, which grew more numerous with every year. Lancers moved into the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" with their families, leaving their own villages completely deserted. In 1774, Güldenstädt noticed several settlements abandoned by Lancers. He mentions Zelena, Zhovta, Kamyanka and others.<sup>238</sup> Lancers not only increased the population of the "Free Lands," but also provided the Zaporozhians with many a leader in their struggle against the Russian army. One of the most uncompromising and vigorous of the commanders of the Zaporozhian units which escorted Lancers and peasants from the New Russia province to Zaporizhzhya was Demyan Virmenko, a former company clerk in the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment, where he was known under the name of Mayakovs'kyi.<sup>239</sup>

#### VII. RELATIONS BETWEEN THE SETTLERS OF NEW RUSSIA PROVINCE AND THE ZAPOROZHIAN

The Zaporozhians interpreted their release from the Tatar protectorate (1734) as a token of full amnesty extended to them by the tsarist government and as a reinstatement of all

<sup>237</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>238</sup> Güldenstädt, *op. cit.*, II, 184, 185.

<sup>239</sup> Huslysty, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59.

the rights which they had lost during their stay with the Tatars. What the Zaporozhians had primarily in mind was a right to all their land, to the "Free Lands." The Russian government took a different attitude. Since, in its opinion, the Zaporozhians had simply returned to the Russian rule, it disregarded their claims to the territory of Zaporizhzhya. This divergence in views led to friction which soon developed into a protracted struggle between the tsarist government and the Zaporozhians.

In 1751, the struggle was acerbated when Nova Serbiya was founded on the Zaporozhian territory. Nova Serbiya authorities did not recognize any of the Zaporozhian rights. They treated Zaporozhian possessions as a no-man's land or a territory inhabited by some hostile tribe. They issued charters authorizing the establishment of settlements on Zaporozhian lands along the Great and Little Inhul, the Samotkan', and the Domotkan'.<sup>240</sup>

The same tense relations developed in the east. There, the struggle for land was concentrated in the Orel district, where the largest Zaporozhian winter quarters and homesteads were situated.<sup>241</sup> At first, the Zaporozhians tried to defend their rights by legal means. They drew up complaints and sent representatives to the capital, instructed to prove the Zaporozhian claims to their lands. Such was the beginning of wrangling which lasted twenty years. The Zaporozhians referred to their rights, produced copies of the charter of Stefan Batory and Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi's proclamation, etc., while the authorities in the capital asked for originals which the Zaporozhians did not possess. In the twenty years between 1756 and 1775 representatives of the Host were almost uninterruptedly in St. Petersburg. They whiled away their time by writing petitions, showering magnates with gifts, supplying them with fish and with wine by the barrel, and bringing tho-

<sup>240</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 176; Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 132-133.

<sup>241</sup> Evarnitski, *Vol'nosti...*, pp. 312-33.

roughbred horses and even camels. Zaporozhian complaints were carefully read in the Senate, terms for the consideration of their case were duly fixed, and the Zaporozhians were assured that their claims would be investigated with due attention. All this confirmed their belief that not the right to their territories, but merely the authenticity of the copies were in doubt. One day the originals would be found in the archives and everything would be straightened out.<sup>242</sup>

However, the search in the archives went on at a much slower pace than actual events. Here and there, representatives of the Russian administration seized lands and founded new settlements on the sites of winter quarters, and clashes occurred between the new inhabitants and the Zaporozhians.<sup>243</sup> The latter began to take up arms in defense of their rights, raiding the settlements, burning them, ransacking them, and kidnapping people and cattle. This, in turn, provoked repressive measures from the Russian administration.

The commander of the St. Elizabeth Fortress, Murav'yov, played an interesting part in this struggle. He disregarded the orders of Glebov, the Governor General of Kiev, who had prohibited his interfering in the affairs of Zaporizhzhya. Murav'yov even defied the instructions of the Senate. In his opinion, the only way of fighting the Zaporozhians, whom he did not distinguish from the *haydamaky*, consisted in erecting a line of outposts which would secure peace for the region and prevent the population of *Het'manshchyna* and Slobids'ka Ukraine from taking refuge in Zaporizhzhya. By Murav'yov's orders, the line of outposts grew rapidly on the Zaporozhian territory, running along its northern border. The Zaporozhians appealed to the Senate with the request that the outposts be abolished, but their petition did not meet with success.<sup>244</sup>

Having despaired of obtaining help from the government the Zaporozhians began to take the "liberation" of their lands

<sup>242</sup> *KTsADA*, No. 8263; Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, p. 135.

<sup>243</sup> *KTsADA*, No. 8263.

<sup>244</sup> Evarnitski, *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kozakov*, II.

from the new settlers into their own hands. In 1763, the Camp ordered the colonel of Bohohard to expel the settlers from the region of the Southern Bug and Snyukha rivers. As a result of this order, the settlements of Pishchanyi Brid and Lysa Hora were destroyed.<sup>245</sup> In the following year, an officer, Porokhnya, executing the Camp's order, had to clear the Orel district of settlers who did not recognize the Camp's rule.<sup>246</sup>

The tension along the borders of Zaporizhzhya became even more pronounced after the establishment of the New Russia province in 1764. A large zone between the Orel and the Inhul and the Samara and the Luhan' was incorporated into the new province. Should the inhabitants of this area refuse to recognize the authority of New Russia, the Senate ordered their resettlement "in Little Russia."<sup>247</sup> The Zaporozhians realized that an even more grave danger faced them. Sporadic encroachments by Novoserbiyans and Slavyanoserbiyans were now replaced by a methodical seizure of their lands.

In 1767 the Senate ordered a definitive dividing line between the New Russia province and the Zaporozhian lands to be drawn. A special commission, composed of representatives of the *Het'manshchyna*, the St. Elizabeth fortress, and the Zaporozhian Host, was entrusted with this task. Several attempts at tracing the border had been made beginning in 1755 but were all unsuccessful. Now, without waiting for the end of the surveying, A. P. Mel'gunov, the commander in chief of the New Russia province, ordered a provisional border fixed along distinctive topographical points between the Samotkan' and Chornyi Tashlyk. It came to be known as "Mel'gunov's line." Far from introducing anything new into the general state of things, the survey only added to the

<sup>245</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 257.

<sup>246</sup> Evarnitski, *Sbornik materialov*, pp. 180-181; *Arkhiv Kosha Zaporozhskikh kozakov* file XX, No. 162 (94), sheet 80-81.

<sup>247</sup> *Arkhiv kosha...*, file XVIII, No. 1411 (135); file XX, No. 162 (94), sheet 8-15.

existing confusion. The Zaporozhians were convinced that the new border, i. e., "Mel'gunov's line," had been confirmed. In reality, it was only a project.<sup>248</sup> Days passed without bringing any new developments. The Zaporozhians continued to send complaints and to dispatch their representatives to the capital, requesting that the territory which had been incorporated into Nova Serbiya and seized by the landlords be returned to them. In one of their complaints the Zaporozhians expressed their certitude that their lands would be returned to them soon and pointed out that they were waiting patiently in order to avoid an internal struggle.<sup>249</sup>

Of course these were mere words and the Zaporozhians did not show any patience. On the contrary, armed raids against the settlements of the New Russia province became more frequent and more determined with every day. Especially fierce was the Zaporozhian struggle with the new settlers. The situation was complicated by the fact that an area considered by the Zaporozhians as theirs had been incorporated into the district of Izyum. Naturally enough, the struggle acquired an especially fierce character here. The Zaporozhians founded a new district of Barvinkova Stinka on the disputed land, which was a welcome refuge for people coming from Slobidska Ukraine and *Het'manshchyna*. This led to protests on the part of the authorities of Tor, Izyum, and the landlords.

The struggle to the south of the "Ukrainian Line," along the Orel River, also entered an acute stage. Refugees from the Kytayhorod, Mayachka, and the Tsarychanka *sotni* had been settling there for a long time.<sup>250</sup> The government had recognized these lands as Zaporozhian property. On the other hand, in 1770 the Cossack Camp ordered Porokhnya to see that people who were not its subjects did not settle there.<sup>251</sup>

<sup>248</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 277-278.

<sup>249</sup> A. Shimanov, *op. cit.*, pp. 622-25.

<sup>250</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 612-16.

<sup>251</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, 152.

The Camp itself complained against the settlers of the Catherine district who left their lands behind the "Ukrainian Line" and seized territories lying to the south to found settlements and villages, and devastate lands and appendages belonging to the Host.<sup>252</sup>

In fact, the landlords' colonization continued to penetrate deeper into the south. In this process the landlords seized Zaporozhian winter quarters and homesteads. Documentary material, meticulously collected by Bishop Feodosii, contains many references to this southward movement. In 1760 lands along the Lozova River, long held by the Zaporozhians, were taken over by Major Bozhedarovych who founded the settlement of Bozhedarivka there.<sup>253</sup> In 1761 the old Zaporozhian area, Kozyrshchyna on the Orel River, named after the winter quarters of the Cossack Kozyr, became the property of Lyzander, a colonel of the Kozlov regiment (it is unclear why Feodosii considered him an "old Zaporozhian").<sup>254</sup> In 1773, the winter quarters of Cossack Bezridnyi in Makariv'skyi Yar on the Donets passed to Roshkovych, a colonel and a deputy.<sup>255</sup> These are only a few examples.

Similar occurrences took place along the northwestern border of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands." The settlement of the Moldavian regiment was the stumbling block here. In spite of the fact that Voyeikov had ordered that Zaporozhian lands not be used for regimental settlements (an order issued, of course, after the regiment had been established on these lands) and advised the Zaporozhians to avoid clashes with the settlers of the Moldavian regiment and live with them "in neighborly understanding," the Cossack Camp took an indignant and hostile attitude towards these settlements and a struggle began. The Zaporozhians raided the villages, sacked and

<sup>252</sup> Evarnitski, *Vol'nosti...*, pp. 317, 318, 323.

<sup>253</sup> Feodosii, *Materialy...*, II, 156.

<sup>254</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 369.

<sup>255</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 95.

burned them down.<sup>256</sup> The settlers of the Moldavian regiment, led by Colonel Lupul-Zverev, proceeded ever deeper into the Zaporozhian territory and robbed the Zaporozhians of their possessions. Voyerikov was overwhelmed with complaints submitted by both contending parties. In 1772, he decreed that all those who had settled without his permission should be deported. This decision affected the settlers of the Moldavian regiment the most. Colonel Lupul-Zverev did not dispute the order but rather turned to the Cossack Camp with a request not to ruin people who had lived there for two years. Simultaneously he informed the Camp that he had been ordered by the Yelizavetgrad district chancery to found new settlements along the Orel and the Sukhyi Tashlyk rivers. In its answer the Cossack Camp vigorously prohibited this, since, it argued, these lands belonged to the Zaporozhian Host.<sup>257</sup>

An intense struggle went on along the northern border of the Zaporozhian "Free Lands." The founding of settlements within the limits of the Kodak district on the Domohtan' River met with an energetic protest from the Zaporozhians. They chased the inhabitants of the settlement of Borodaïvka from their houses and brought some of them to the Sich under arrest.<sup>258</sup> In the same year, 1772, the population living on the banks of the Lozovata River was deported. The regimental officer Lukyanov notified the Camp that the inhabitants of Zhovten'ka consented to recognize its rule; therefore he had permitted them to remain in the settlement.<sup>259</sup>

These examples, the number of which might be increased, illustrate the conditions and the forms of the struggle between the Zaporozhians and the settlement inhabitants, the old and the new owners of the lands. Of course, the results of the

<sup>256</sup> *Arkhiv kosh...*, file XXVII, No. 223 (266); file XXXI, No. 273 (291). Zverev gives the following figures: Zaporozhians abducted from the Moldavian Regiment 581 horses, 414 oxen, 321 cows, 341 sheep. *Ibid.*, file XXVII, No. 223 (266), sheet 4-5.

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, file XXXII, No. 273 (291), sheet 19, 24, 27, 33.

<sup>258</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, 152.

<sup>259</sup> *Arkhiv kosh...*, file XXXII, No. 273 (291) sheet 39-40.



struggle were only of provisional significance since at first it had been caused by arbitrary seizures of Zaporozhian possessions by individuals.

The continued struggle for land called for the defense of the frontiers by the Russian government. It is for that reason that a line of redoubts and outposts was erected along the Zaporozhian border. The map collection of the Odessa Scientific Society possesses an interesting map showing the locations of these redoubts. We learn from the explanatory readings of the map that some of the redoubts had been standing along the Zaporozhian border for some time; others had been constructed more recently along the same border; finally, the map contains a series of redoubts, the construction of which was planned. All these redoubts pushed the Russian frontier forward deep into Zaporozhian lands. They had to be built in front of the outposts. Thus the map provides an illustration of the forward movement of the redoubts. According to A. Skal'kovski there were only sixteen outposts in 1774, but the map shows more than thirty outposts and redoubts.

At this juncture it might be useful to quote the "Separate Opinion" of Count N. Panin which he submitted in connection with the organization of the New Russia province. In it, he advised the founding of a "hostel" on the Orel, or on the Southern Bug. The manifest purpose of this "hostel" was to serve as a trading post in commercial relations with Turkey. In reality it was to provide a facade for a stronghold which would keep the "irregular neighbors of that region" at bay. It is clear whom Panin meant by these "irregular neighbors."<sup>260</sup>

In 1769 Zaporozhian affairs took a new turn. Up to that time disputes centered along the northern border of Zaporizhzhya. Nothing except Tatar incursions threatened the Zaporozhians from the south and no one raised any question as to their claims to this southern territory. However, the first successes of the Russian armies on the Turkish front extended the sphere of Russian influence southward. In 1769 Azov and

<sup>260</sup> Odessk. istor. muzei, *Zbirka*. . . , II-30-64, sheet 129.

Taganrog were reconquered and Cossack troops were garrisoned there for the protection of these places.<sup>261</sup> The government appealed to the Cossacks to volunteer for these troops.<sup>262</sup> Retired soldiers who had lived to the north of the "Ukrainian Line" were now settled beyond it. They were mainly men without families (*bobyli*). New settlements, such as Zhrebets', Kins'ke, Kamysheuka, Novohryhorivka were founded for them on Zaporozhian territory in 1770.<sup>263</sup> The village of Zhrebets' was founded on the site of a Zaporozhian homestead in Velykyi Luh and the village of Kins'ke, in Zaporozhian winter quarters. In addition to retired soldiers, convicts and passportless vagrants were also settled.<sup>264</sup> In 1770 there began a resettlement of merchants and craftsmen from the Voronezh and Bilhorod provinces to Taganrog. With them, strong competition for the eastern Zaporozhian trade made its appearance.<sup>265</sup>

The year 1770 witnessed the beginning of the construction of a new fortified line between the Dnepr and the Berda, called the "Dnepr Line." These fortifications and the settlements connected with them took up a large area belonging to the Zaporozhians.<sup>266</sup> That the Russian government attributed great importance to the construction of this Line appears clear from Catherine II's order to the governor of the Slobids'ka province, Shcherbinin.<sup>267</sup> The new Line, Catherine wrote, was to protect the Slobids'ka and the "Little Russia" provinces as well as the lands situated beyond the "Ukrainian Line." Since it was to be hoped that the number of inhabitants would rapidly increase in this region, measures should

<sup>261</sup> *Arkhiv gosud. soveta*, I, Part 1, 226, 335-336.

<sup>262</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronol. obozr.*, I, 81-82.

<sup>263</sup> *Spiski naseleennykh mest Yekaterinoslavskoi gubernii* [Lists of Populated Points of the Ekaterinoslav Province], 1863, XIX, 44; Novitski, *Istoriya goroda Aleksandrovskia*, p. 1.

<sup>264</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, II, 268-269, 274.

<sup>265</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 81-82.

<sup>266</sup> *Ibid.*, I, 84-86; Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, 129-135.

<sup>267</sup> Skal'kovski, *Khronolog. obozr.*, I, 86; Novitski, *Istoriya goroda Aleksandrovskia*, pp. 2-3.

be taken beforehand in order to secure "advantages" for them. These views are very interesting; they prove that four or five years before the abolition of the Zaporozhian Sich a plan was already in existence to colonize a part of the Zaporozhian lands under government sponsorship. This order was unknown to the Zaporozhian Camp, but local politicians quite justly assessed the significance of the fact that fortifications were to be built on Zaporozhian territories. First attempts to erect this Line were made as early as 1769, when the Zaporozhian Host and its officers were campaigning on the Dnestr River. Suddenly, without any warning, surveyors arrived and began to assign sites for future fortifications. Stations were established between the Samara entrenchment and the Azov Sea and outposts built along the Orel and the Chaplynka rivers. When the Zaporozhian officers, who were replacing those absent on campaign, learned about these actions, alarm spread among the Zaporozhians. "It seems as if the final hour has come for the steppe... everything is gone." These were the terms in which Pylyp L'vivs'kyi, acting Camp chief, notified the Camp chief, Kalnyshevs'kyi, of the events.<sup>268</sup>

At first, the Zaporozhians attempted direct intervention. An officer, acting as the Cossack Camp's plenipotentiary, came to the line and requested that the outposts built on Zaporozhian territory be demolished. But Count Panin sternly instructed the Camp "to keep the Cossacks from insolent deeds," to punish those who had perpetrated such deeds and to keep in mind from then on that the outposts were being built on Panin's orders and no damage should be done to them.<sup>269</sup>

Then, the Zaporozhians turned to their usual tactics, namely, to complaints and petitions. First of all, they approached Prince Dolgoruki, the commander of the Army, and called his attention to the fact that a large number of people were fleeing from Zaporozhzhya to the new settlements and winter

<sup>268</sup> Novitski, *Istoriya goroda Aleksandrovskaya*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>269</sup> *Arkhiv kosh...*, file XXVIII, No. 234/45, sheet 4; Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, 132.

quarters, belonging to Cossacks serving in the army, were being destroyed and soldiers were cutting down forests and orchards. Dolgoruki pointed out in reply, that the strongholds were being built according to the Empress' plan and that therefore nothing could be changed. But the Cossacks did not give up. In 1771, they complained to the Empress herself. They enumerated all the wrongs done to them, such as the seizure of lands situated on the right and left banks of the Dnepr and their transformation into the Yelizavetgrad and the Catherine districts. But the main stress in the complaint lay on the building of the "Dnepr Line," which had resulted in the destruction of their winter quarters and orchards. The Cossacks asked to be repaid for damages suffered.<sup>270</sup> Unfortunately, it is not known whether they received an answer or whether an answer was dispatched at all.

It must be said that in this struggle for land the Zaporozhians could sometimes entertain hopes of success. Help came quite unexpectedly. In 1764, Count Panin submitted a note to Catherine II concerning more efficient measures to protect the southern borders of the Empire. He expressed the opinion that the Yelizavetgrad district, far from providing protection to the state, required great expenditure for its own defense and, generally speaking, did not bring any advantage to the state.<sup>271</sup> It possessed no natural defenses and would fall an easy prey to the first Tatar or Turkish invasion. Although the troops stationed in the province were not strong enough to defend it, they cost the government a considerable amount of money, fourteen or fifteen thousand rubles a year a regiment. Unable to defend itself, the district was only embarrassing the capital by its requests of help. It was obvious that settlers would be reluctant to establish themselves in a region so badly protected. On the other hand, if it remained completely unpopulated, it would be more difficult for the enemy to reach the Russian borders. Panin was therefore of the opinion

<sup>270</sup> Novitski, *Istoriya goroda Aleksandrovsk*, pp. 22-25.

<sup>271</sup> Odessk. istor. muzei, *Zbirka...*, No. II-20-64, sheets 137-141.

that all the inhabitants of the province should be removed to the left bank of the Dnepr and established between the Samara and the Luhan' or in the Bakhmut area. All troops should leave the province and be distributed among the garrisons of the "Ukrainian Line." The territory of the province should be left unoccupied and settling there, prohibited. Then, Panin concluded, "the New Russia province will flourish, and the Empire's frontiers there will be fortified and protected." Such is the content of this interesting note. Unfortunately, its final fate remains unknown. We can only surmise that it was Nikita Panin, who showed great interest in Zaporizhzhya and who commissioned the historian Müller to write his "Consideration."<sup>272</sup>

In any case, Panin's opinion that the Yelizavetgrad district of his time was a liability to the state was not forgotten. It paralleled the main conclusions reached in 1763 by the official inspector who had made an inquiry into the state of Nova Serbiya's affairs. Still, Panin's sweeping plan calling for the cancellation of all the achievements of the colonization, the deportation of all the inhabitants, the burning of all the villages, and the turning of the whole region into a wilderness, not only frightened the government but ran counter to its continuous endeavors to increase the population. It is possible that a third compromise took shape at this juncture.

In 1765 a Zaporozhian delegation headed by Kalnyshevs'kyi arrived in St. Petersburg. Its goal was to obtain the restitution of the territories transformed into Nova Serbiya. The archives of the Zaporozhian Cossack Camp contain a large number of documents pertaining to this delegation. A portion of them was utilized by Skal'kovski in his *Istoriya Novoi Sechi* (History of the New Sich). On August 25, 1765, Kalnyshevs'kyi informed the Camp of the meeting of a special commission which considered the affairs of the Host. Count N. I. Panin, Count Z. G. Chernyshev, and Prince A. A. Vyazemski were its members. Panin declared that the entire territory upon which Nova

<sup>272</sup> *Chuteniya*, 1846, Book 5.

Serbiya had been founded would be returned to the Host and that the Novoserbiyans should settle along the Samara and the upper Orel. On August 26, Kalnyshevs'kyi again attended a meeting of the commission at which a final decision was reached, giving the Orel region to the Novoserbiyans and leaving the tributaries of the Samara to the Zaporozhians. Kalnyshevs'kyi sent a detailed report of this meeting to the Cossack Camp. Nevertheless, the year 1766 arrived and the delegates still were in Petersburg awaiting the decision and writing gloomy reports to the camp. It turned out that they were awaiting the arrival of local administrators in Petersburg before reaching a final solution to the affair. Von Brandt, I. F. Glebov, and Count P. A. Rumyantsev arrived in February. A. I. Bibikov, who had conducted the tracing of the frontiers between Zaporizhzhya and Poland some time before, was yet to arrive.<sup>273</sup>

In May of 1766 Kalnyshevs'kyi wrote that Chernyshev had given him verbal assurance that the territory of Nova Serbiya would be returned to the Zaporozhians but that a fortified line would be constructed between the Samara and the Orel rivers. Zaporozhian delegates raised objections to the latter decision. Kalnyshevs'kyi complained about von Brandt whose projects were proving to be highly embarrassing. In July of the same year, Kalnyshevs'kyi reported once more to the Camp that the project concerning the return of lands to the Zaporozhians had already been submitted to the Empress and her ministers but that no final decision could be reached since some unclear points of a cartographical nature had arisen. Still, he wrote, "we shall obtain what we want; whatever the large and small officials say, the decision of the Empress is still binding."<sup>274</sup>

A very interesting and important document which, it seems, parallels Kalnyshevs'kyi's reports is available. Its title is "The

<sup>273</sup> *Arkhiv Kosha...*, file XX, No. 162 (94), sheets 181-193; Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 287.

<sup>274</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 287.

Procedure for Transferring the Military Men at Present Living in the Yelizavetgrad District to the New Russia Province and the Carrying Out of this Operation." This document has come down to us among the papers of H. A. Poletyka, in a careless copy written in a late eighteenth century hand.<sup>275</sup> It bears the signatures of General Ivan Glebov, Count Peter Rumyantsev, Count Nikita Panin, Count Zakhari Chernyshev, Jacob von Brandt, Count (*sic*) Alexander Vyazemski, in that order. As was seen, all these are persons referred to by Kalnyshevs'kyi in 1766. The document is not dated; Vyazemski's title has been copied erroneously. He was a prince, not a count. The content of this document closely corresponds to the reports of Kalnyshevs'kyi and Panin's "Note."

The "Procedure" may be divided into two parts: the first, corresponding to other official documents, does not give rise to any doubts; the second, contains completely new material. The first part contains points concerning the division of the province into districts,<sup>276</sup> the construction of strongholds<sup>277</sup> between Samara and Bakhmut, the incorporation of *Het'manshchyna* territories into the New Russia province, the fate of the inhabitants of these territories,<sup>278</sup> and the decoration of Court Councilor Odobash for having recruited two hundred and fifty people abroad. Of course, the part of the "Procedure" which is not duplicated by other documents of the epoch is more interesting. It amounts to a detailed program for the reform of the region, consisting in the transfer of the population of the Yelizavetgrad district to the left bank of the Dnepr. The Zaporozhian winter quarters are to remain on the Samara but they are not to differ in their status from ordinary settlements of the province's inhabitants. All military men moving to the left bank will be able to collect their pay up to May,

<sup>275</sup> *Zbirka Sudiyenka* [Collection of Sudiyenko]. Biblioteka Ukrains'koi Akademii Nauk, Rukopysnyi viddil. [Library of Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Manuscript Division].

<sup>276</sup> *PSZ*, No. 12180, June II, 1764.

<sup>277</sup> *PSZ*, No. 12336, September 6, 1765.

<sup>278</sup> *PSZ*, No. 12099, March 22, 1764.

1767 and will be free to enroll in the Samara and Bakhmut or the newly formed Dnepr and Donets Cossack regiments. (This is an error; the last two were Lancer and not Cossack regiments). The merchants of the St. Elizabeth fortress will be able to move into the towns and strongholds of the New Russia province or will be free to return to Russia. Chanceries, garrisons, artillery, engineering units, and all state property will be gradually removed to the strongholds of the Catherine district and Bakhmut county. Churches are to be dismantled and their ikons and property moved away. A glass-factory near the Polish border could not be removed because of the lack of wood on the left bank. It could only be moved into a locality where forests are abundant, e. g., onto the estates of von Stoffeln or Kochubey.

After the transfer, all settlers who establish themselves along the "Ukrainian Line" will be free of obligations for a period of two to three years. This term will be extended to four years for those who will settle on the Samara. They will be allotted plots amounting to thirty *desyatiny* and, after the expiration of the period of exemptions, they will pay annually one ruble, fifty kopecks. Landlords will pay half as much. The Yelizavetgrad district is to be returned to the Zaporozhians under the following conditions: They are to raze the outposts along the line Kalynivka-Chornyi Tashlyk-Kaharlyk. Lands taken away in 1764 are to be returned to them and they are to assume the responsibility for peace along the Polish frontier. The Zaporozhians are to promise not to receive fugitive soldiers and not to allow married Zaporozhian Cossacks to settle and they are to leave a buffer zone, twenty kilometers wide, unpopulated. The custom house is to be established in Kodak, instead of Tsarychanka. The Zaporozhians are to lose their right to duty-free trade in salt, fish, and wine with Poland. Quarantine posts are to be built along the Samara, opposite Novosillya, Myktyns'kyi ford, and Kremenchuk. Such is the content of this interesting document.

It is not clear which one, if any, of the several copies of



this document has been preserved in Poletyka's collection, nor do we know where the original is. It is possible that we have here the copy of the decision for which the Zaporozhians had been waiting so long. The document is to be dated into the year 1766 or the beginning of the year 1767, since May of 1767 is mentioned there as the date before which the population should be moved onto the left bank of the Dnepr.

Another document entitled "Petition of the Zaporozhian Host with Commentary" closely resembles the one discussed above. It is preserved in the State Archives and has been published by S. Solov'yev in an abridged form.<sup>279</sup> A copy of this document is also to be found in Poletyka's collection.<sup>280</sup> It is more complete than the text printed by Solov'yev but it contains many errors, some of them orthographic. The divergencies between Solov'yev's text and Poletyka's manuscript are considerable, beginning with the format of both documents. Solov'yev printed the petition first and let it be followed by Chernyshev's "objections"; Poletyka's copy presents these objections in a separate column, opposing the Zaporozhian petition point by point. There are also divergencies in content: Although the first points of the petition and Chernyshev's objections have been printed by Solov'yev in a more detailed form, his text omits several lines preserved by Poletyka's copy. Neither of the versions of the petition is explicitly dated, but we can deduce the time of the document from the wording of its preface. "A year ago," it reads, "Count Chernyshev declared that the lands of Nova Serbiya were to be returned to the Zaporozhians. Still, they have not yet been returned; what is more, rumor has it that lands stretching as far as the Samara will be taken away from them." It may be seen from this preface that the petition was submitted one year after Kalnyshevs'kyi's negotiations with Chernyshev which

<sup>279</sup> Solov'yev, *Istoriya Rossii*, Book VI, pp. 302-304.

<sup>280</sup> *Zbirka Sudiyenka, portfel' Poletyky* [Folder of Poletyka], Bibl. Ukr. Akad. Nauk, Rukop. viddil.

took place on August 26, 1766; in other words, the document dates from the autumn of 1767 at the earliest.

The content of this document contains the following points: (1) The Zaporozhians express their apprehension that, should Novoserbiyans settle along the Samara, it might lead to misunderstandings between the two. Chernyshev's "objections," or "commentary," points out that the Zaporozhians themselves are the source of these misunderstandings. (2) The Zaporozhians refer to the grants of the Polish kings, on the basis of which they ruled over the Samara area. The "commentary" observes that they had lost all their rights in 1708 and that these lands had then come under Russian rule and were defended by Russian armies. (3) The Zaporozhians prove that numerous Zaporozhian settlements exist along the Samara. The "commentary" remarks that there is no objection to their continued existence under the authority of the New Russia province. Point 4, omitted by Solov'yev, is very interesting; in it, the construction of strongholds along the Samara is referred to as an impossibility. Objections are raised against their construction along the Orel and Toret's rivers. The "commentary" points out that fortresses are to be built against "vagrant evil-doers" and adds that the Zaporozhians failed to assist the Russian government during the last war. This reference to the war of 1768-1774 leads us to believe that the point was introduced at a later date into the text from which Poletyka's copy had been made. This objection may have been inspired by the manifesto of 1775.

Under point 2 (following the numeration as it appears in the document) the Zaporozhians express the wish that strongholds be built and people settled, not along the Samara, but along the Orel. To this the "commentary" objects that these lands are not fit for settlements since the Orel area has few forests and the soil in the Bakhmut district is poor, whereas the area of each of the Zaporozhians' winter quarters amounts to fifteen to twenty *desyatiny*. Point 3 in Poletyka's copy is omitted by Solov'yev. In it the Zaporozhians express a desire

to renew the borders of 1714 since, they point out, the Samara winter quarters have been in existence since the time of the Polish kings. The "commentary" stresses the fact that the winter quarters may remain under the rule of the New Russia province or else their owners may be granted lands elsewhere in that province. (4) The Zaporozhians ask once more that promises made to them earlier be fulfilled, namely, that Nova Serbiya be returned to the Host and its inhabitants be re-settled in the Orel area. The "commentary" confirms the fact that the Zaporozhians are being given all the territory between the Southern Bug and the Dnepr, except the buffer zone. The Host may settle anyone it wishes there, with the exception of married Cossacks, since their families would be joined by refugees from the "Little Russia" and the Slobids'ka provinces, and in case of an enemy attack, a whole army would not be enough to protect these people. Poletyka's copy contains an additional paragraph to the effect that during the last war the Zaporozhians provided only six thousand troops, half of which went back to Zaporizhzhya.

It is clear that we possess two versions of the Zaporozhian "Petition" and Chernyshev's "Commentary" on it. It is to be assumed that Solov'yev drew from the original, whereas a copy with later additions has been preserved among Poletyka's papers. The original was probably composed in the years 1766-1767, a year after the discussion of the Yelizavetgrad district question in St. Petersburg and Kalnyshevskiy's talks with Chernyshev.

It is difficult to say what prevented the execution of the plan outlined between 1765 and 1766. In 1769 the Tatar hordes swept like a hurricane across the whole of the Yelizavetgrad district, destroying everything on their way, burning villages, and carrying off captives and cattle. Several hundred villages lay in ruins. The problem of protecting the Yelizavetgrad district arose again. These events gave the incentive to a new note, composed by Count P. Rumyantsev and F. Voyeikov, the Commander in Chief of the Russian army and

the Governor General of Kiev, respectively. It was entitled, "Plan for Protecting the Inhabitants of the Yelizavetgrad District in this Present Time of War, that is, in the Year of 1769."<sup>281</sup> It was aimed against the project of Count Panin. Its authors argued that it would not be advantageous to move the population of the Yelizavetgrad district to the left bank of the Dnepr since conditions there might be even worse than those prevailing on the right bank. Moreover, the transfer of the population would entail great expense. Therefore the note proposed that the inhabitants be moved from the southern to the northern part of the district. This report, too, was disregarded by the government and everything remained unchanged.

During the last years of Zaporizhzhya's independent existence, the question of the return of lands transformed into the Yelizavetgrad district arose once more, (towards the end of 1773 and the beginning of 1774), this time in the Council of State. On receiving Zaporozhian complaints, the Council of State decided to send someone on a special mission to investigate on the scene. Without waiting for the result of this investigation, Catherine II declared, at a meeting of the Council of State held on May 12, 1774, that the dispute concerning the Zaporozhian lands should be resolved definitively. Since the Zaporozhian Host held the territory before the formation of the Catherine and the Yelizavetgrad districts, it would be just, Catherine thought, to "satisfy" the Zaporozhians with one or the other of these districts. However, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Count Panin, objected to this plan and put forward all kinds of arguments in favor of maintaining these districts and, if possible, defending them. At a meeting of the Council of State on May 19, 1774 there was read a brief compiled from various documents and composed in the Senate, concerning the various stages of the establishment of Nova Serbiya and the province of New Russia. Count Panin and Count K. Rozumovs'kyi argued in their reports that even if

<sup>281</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 76, No. 1666, 114-115.

the Zaporozhians had had claims to these territories, they had lost them in 1734 since these rights were not confirmed after their return to Russian protection. The Council of State decided to summon the Hosts' plenipotentiaries and to ask them to produce written proof establishing Zaporozhian rights to the disputed territory. The plenipotentiaries arrived. A year passed and the question still remained unsettled. On February 19, 1775 the Council of State once more took the question of the rights to the disputed territory under consideration. A Zaporozhian petition was read at the meeting claiming the return not only of Nova Serbiya but of the territories stretching down to the Black Sea, on which the "Dnepr Line" had been built, and of the lands ceded by Poland, and also requesting payment for damages done to the Zaporozhians by Russian commanders. The Council of State asked the Senate about the rights of the Zaporozhians to these territories and requested the College of Foreign Affairs to send the charter of Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi on which the Zaporozhians based their claims. Days passed. On May 7, 1775 the very same Council of State decreed that "the Camp of these Cossacks as the source of their unruliness, be destroyed. When order is restored among them, authority will be established over them. Fugitive families from New Russia, who have settled among them, shall be returned to their former abodes."<sup>282</sup> This official document is highly interesting. It proves that there was no unanimity as to the solution of the Zaporozhians' fate and that Catherine II herself was inclined to recognize their rights to their lands and to return a part of their "Free Lands" to them. Folk songs on the abolition of the Sich can be mentioned in support of this. Some of them make Catherine responsible for Zaporozhians' doom; others are of the opinion that Catherine was unable to help Zaporozhians because of "big lords and lord senators."<sup>283</sup>

<sup>282</sup> *Arkhiv gosudarstvennogo soveta*, I, Part 2, 219-222.

<sup>283</sup> Y. Novitski, *Zaporozhskaya i malorossiiskaya starina v pamyatnikakh ustnogo tvorchestva* [Zaporozhians' and Little Russia's Past in the Monuments of Oral Tradition], p. 102; Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Manifest 1775 r...", *op. cit.*

These events were also reflected in the work of a contemporary, Captain Stanislav Zarul's'kyi. He wrote that Catherine had summoned the representatives of the Host and promised them that their claims would be looked into after the end of the war. The Senate decided that the Zaporozhians should produce the documents upon which they based their claims. However, when it turned out that the original charters had been lost and that all the Cossacks could produce were copies, Catherine II decreed that "the previous course be followed without the slightest change."<sup>284</sup>

Of course, the "lost charters" of the Zaporozhian Host were not the real issue. The key to the situation lay in the fact that after the conclusion of the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainardji, the perpetuation of Zaporizhzhya was made superfluous. Up to then, it had shielded the Empire's southern frontiers. Now, vast territories, including Azov, Kerch, Yenikale, and Kinburn had been gained by Russia in the south. More important, the Crimea, no longer Turkey's vassal, likewise ceased to be a vanguard against Russia. Surrounded on all sides by Russian possessions, Zaporizhzhya not only was no longer useful; rather, it proved to be an obstacle to Russian colonization and trade in the south. Zaporozhian diplomats were unable to grasp this change and continued to hope that their lands in the Yelizavetgrad district would be returned to them "in the next year at the latest." Such was the tenor of their letters, dispatched from St. Petersburg to the Cossack camp in 1774.<sup>285</sup>

The petition submitted to Catherine by the Cossack Camp after the conclusion of the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainardji shows a complete lack of understanding of the changed conditions of the time. The Zaporozhians petitioned the Empress not only for the return of the Novoserbiyan lands, but also for the restitution of territories which once had been ceded to Turkey and had returned to Russia on the basis of the recent

<sup>284</sup> S. Zarul'ski, "Zamechaniya do Maloi Rossii prinadlezhashchiye" [Observations Pertaining to Little Russia], *Chteniya*, IV, 1848, No. 1, part 2, 23-24.

<sup>285</sup> Shimanov, *op. cit.*, pp. 622-25.

treaty. They mentioned the Bug and Dnepr *limany*, the Black Sea shore, the salt lakes, in short, all the area conquered by Russia.<sup>286</sup>

An interesting exchange of views took place between the Camp and G. A. Potemkin who had been appointed Commander in Chief of the province of New Russia in 1774. From his predecessor, F. Voyeikov, Potemkin had inherited a large number of unresolved cases, e.g., Zaporozhian complaints of, and reports on, oppression suffered at the hands of the Russian commanders, as well as the latter's grievances directed against the Zaporozhians. He addressed a letter to the Cossack Camp, in which he announced his appointment and proposed that justice be done to the claims of the inhabitants of New Russia and that the Camp prohibit the Cossacks from molesting these inhabitants in the future. "I like the poor Cossacks," he wrote, "being a Sich-man myself. Therefore I shall not report them without a compelling reason. I expect that in return... they will not give grounds for dissatisfaction."<sup>287</sup> In their reply of July 15, 1774, Camp Chief Kalnyshevs'kyi and the Cossack officers listed the claims which the Cossacks were not willing to abandon. The whole of the New Russia, they wrote, was situated on Zaporozhian land, and the Host continued to hope that it would be allowed to exist independently and that it would repossess its lands. If Potemkin was sincere in his favorable attitude towards the Zaporozhians, he should make use of his influence with the Empress and bring about a quick solution of this affair. Admitting candidates to the rank of companion of the section (*tovarysh kurenya*) of Kutsiv (into which Potemkin had enlisted), the Cossacks expressed the hope that new companions would do their best to assist the "Society" (*tovarystvo*, the name by which the Zaporozhian designated the

<sup>286</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, v. II.

<sup>287</sup> Towards the end of their existence, Zaporozhian Cossack sections began to elect their "comrades" and to issue certificates to various influential people. Besides Potemkin, such certificates were held by Prince Vyazemski, Prince Dolgoruki, Count Panin, Osterman, Naryshkin, Academician Eiler, etc. See: A. Skal'kovski *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, 127-129.

Host). All nations, it was stated in the closing sentences of the letter, defend their possessions; therefore the Cossacks, too, had to defend the right to their lands. Those who live on them now "put various inventions into their petitions...and when we ask for what is due to us, our claims are hushed up."<sup>288</sup>

In describing the last years of Zaporizhzhya's life, one should not forget that it was vastly different from the Zaporizhzhya of the seventeenth or the early eighteenth century. The class differences gained in intensity with every year and the gap between the officers' class and the rank-and-file members of the Zaporozhian Society grew ever larger. The officers became more and more involved in business affairs, taking direct part in trade with the Crimea, Turkey, Poland and Russia. At the same time they concentrated their efforts on agriculture and cattle raising. Towards the end of Zaporizhzhya's existence, the officers counted many large landowners among their members, running prosperous and well-organized estates. At the time of the Sich's liquidation, Kalnyshevs'kyi possessed seven winter quarters with houses, stables, pens, and mills. Large numbers of livestock were raised on these winter quarters. In 1775 Kalnyshevs'kyi possessed 639 horses, 107 cows and oxen, 13,006 sheep and goats—15,880 head of livestock altogether. The *pyshar* of the Host, Hloba, had 13,774 head of livestock in his winter quarters. The Host's Judge, Holovatyi had 1,601 animals in his herds; an officer, Nohay, had 2,551, and Haradzha 2,910.<sup>289</sup> Such members of the officers class were not exceptional. Colonels Rud', Kolpak, and others also owned huge estates.<sup>290</sup>

<sup>288</sup> *Arkhiv Kosha...*, XXXIV, No. 198 (43), 326-327.

<sup>289</sup> N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Mayno zaporoz'koi starshyny, yak dzherelo dlya doslidzhennya sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Zaporizhzhya" [The Possessions of the Zaporozhian *starshyna* as a Source for the Study of the Social and Economic History of Zaporizhzhya], *Pratsi komisii sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Ukrainy* [Narysy z sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Ukrainy], I, Kiev 1932, 77.

<sup>290</sup> Feodosi, *Materialy...*, I, 522; Gr. Nadkhin, *Pamyat' o Zaporozh'i* [In Memory of Zaporizhzhya], Moscow 1879, p. 7; Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, I, 245.



All these estates were chiefly cultivated by hired labor. At the time of the abolition of the Sich, long lists of the hired hands, working in the winter quarters of the officers, were drawn up. They worked under contract for food, clothing, and compensation in money. These laborers may be divided into several categories, the ordinary hired hands and the managers (*hospodari*) of the winter quarters, who enjoyed the full confidence of the owners, drew high salaries and often owned large herds themselves.<sup>291</sup>

The ownership of a large estate and herds of horses, cattle and sheep could bring the landlord into trading operations. The *pysar* Hloba sold a thousand *chetverti* (one *chertvert'* equals a. 200 kgs.) of flour in 1775.<sup>292</sup> Large herds of cattle and horses belonging to the officers were periodically driven to the fairs of Nova Serbiya and Poland. Trade in fish and salt occupied a prominent place in Zaporizhzhya's economy and the lion's share usually went to the officers. In addition to the spoils of war, commercial operations favored the concentration of considerable sums of money in the officers' hands. At the time of the confiscation of the Cossack possessions in 1775, a large amount of ready cash in various currencies (*talers, sfinki, tynfy, funduks, mareli*, Russian *chervontsy* in bills and gold) were found in the possession of the officers. Kalnyshevs'kyi had accumulated 42,520 rubles, 95 kopecks in gold and silver and Hloba 27,648 rubles. This wealth was not limited to gold and silver, which was dead capital. Kalnyshevs'kyi also held promissory notes amounting to several thousand rubles. So, for instance, he had a note for a thousand rubles signed by M. Rud'. Some time earlier he had lent 2,400 rubles to Cossack Karavanets', 900 to a merchant, Kneskov, and 188 rubles to some unknown Cossack.<sup>293</sup> After the liquidation of the Sich, during Kalnyshevs'kyi's banishment, it was disclos-

<sup>291</sup> Yolons'ka-Vasylenko, "Mayno zaporoz'koi starshyny..." *op. cit.*, pp. 60-63.

<sup>292</sup> *Arkhiv Kosha...*, No. 26/17.

<sup>293</sup> Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Mayno zaporoz'koi starshyny..." *op. cit.*, pp. 105, 107, 108.

ed that he had lent 2,000 rubles to the staff-comrade, Rudenko, to the regimental adjutant Mykukha and to Captain Mavroyeni. They had begun to repay their debts and demanded the return of their receipts.<sup>294</sup> Hloba, too, possessed promissory notes for 5,618 rubles.<sup>295</sup>

Lavish donation towards the construction and decoration of churches, made by the officers, also point to large sums of money in its possession. Kalnyshevs'kyi had three large churches built at his own expense: one in Lokhvytsya, in 1763; one in Kiev for the Mezhyhirs'kyi monastery, in 1768; and one in Romny in 1770. In addition, he sent expensive gifts to a church in Jerusalem.<sup>296</sup> Hloba began the construction of a church in the village of Hupalivka, but he was prevented from seeing its completion. By an order of Potemkin, issued in 1776, the builders of the church were paid with the proceeds from the sale of Hloba's confiscated possessions.<sup>297</sup> Holovatyi was less well off than Kalnyshevs'kyi and Hloba; nevertheless, he, too, donated a precious Gospel with a silver binding to the church of Baturyn.<sup>298</sup> In addition to estates and ready cash, the officers had considerable wealth invested in valuables. Kalnyshevs'kyi, for example, had many gold treasures, dishes, watches, and weapons and harnesses adorned with precious stones and pearls.

Of course not all the members of the officer class could boast of such treasures as Kalnyshevs'kyi's and Hloba's and those other representatives of its elite who had concentrated the whole of political and economic power in their hands. The register

<sup>294</sup> P. S. Yefimenko "Kal'nishevski: posledni koshevoi Zaporozhskoi Sechi 1691-1803" [Kalnyshevski: The Last *koshevoi* of the Zaporozhian Sich 1691-1803], *Russkaya starina*, XIV, 1875, No. 3, 416.

<sup>295</sup> Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Mayno zaporoz'koi starshyny...", *op. cit.*, p. 108.

<sup>296</sup> Yefimenko, "Kal'nishevski...", *op. cit.*, p. 408.

<sup>297</sup> A. Bogumil, "K istorii upravleniya Novorossiyeu Potemkinym" [On the History of Potemkin's Administration of New Russia], *Letopis' Yekaterinoslavskoi arkhivnoi komissii* [Chronicle of the Ekaterinoslav Archive Commission], fasc. II, p. 36, No. 507.

<sup>298</sup> Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Mayno zaporoz'koi starshyny...", *op. cit.*, p. 77.

of the officers' confiscated property also sheds light on its middle layer, as it were. For instance, Bilyi had 883 head of cattle; Smola, 587; Kutsyi, 457; Yalovy, 225; in addition to a corresponding number of other types of livestock and winter quarters, etc.<sup>299</sup> Members of this Cossack middle class also frequently engaged in financial transactions. Numerous data indicate that certain Cossacks possessed large sums of money which were confiscated in 1775, e. g., Cossack Smola had 2,000 rubles;<sup>300</sup> Cossack Tyahun, 550 rubles;<sup>301</sup> Colonel Huk, 200 rubles;<sup>302</sup> Cossack Potapenko 4,400 rubles;<sup>303</sup> Cossacks Yakovliv and Stina, 2,115 rubles between them; Colonel Kolpak, 1,000 rubles;<sup>304</sup> etc. Preparing for the campaign of 1769, Luk'yan Velykyi entrusted 2,000 rubles to a priest's wife, Akulyna, and instructed her to lend this money out at interest.<sup>305</sup> The Cossack Camp strictly enforced the prompt fulfillment of financial obligations and itself acted as a money-lender. For instance, in 1770 the Camp lent 600 rubles to one Cossack, and 400 to another. In 1771 a Cossack borrowed 140 rubles from it.<sup>306</sup>

Along with the well-to-do Cossacks there were the poorer ones who owned no property and subsisted on occasional earnings and the profits of war. They made up the bulk of the Host. It is understandable that the interests of the elite, consisting of large landowners and traders, clashed with those of the poor Cossacks (known also as *holota*, i.e., the naked ones). This divergency of interests was sharply reflected in the Camp's policy towards Russia. The ruling elite willingly renounced their right to re-elect officers annually and acquiesc-

299 *Ibid.*

300 *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, file 161, No. 5888.

301 Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 2090-2091.

302 Bogumil, *op. cit.*, II, 63.

303 *Arkhiv Kosha...*, file 86, No. 323/1826.

304 *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, No. 96.

305 Skal'kovski, "Kak sudili i ryadili zaporozhtsy" [How the Zaporozhians Conducted Justice and Made Contracts], *Kiyevskaya starina*, X, IV, 1886, 610.

306 *Arkhiv Kosha...*, file 26, No. 26 (17), 222.

ed in the desire of the tsarist government to establish permanent officials in Zaporizhzhya.<sup>307</sup> The poor Cossacks expressed their discontent by protesting loudly against the elections of candidates, such as Ihnatovych, Fedoriv, Kalnyshevs'kyi, whom they particularly disliked.

Class differences were felt especially strongly during the last years of Zaporizhzhya's independent history. The officers had by various means accumulated considerable wealth, mainly in large estates and money. They took part in commercial operations, e.g., exporting fish and salt, and the political and economic power was concentrated in their hands. They were opposed by the mass of Cossacks (*netyahy, holota*), who juridically enjoyed equal rights with the officers, but in fact lived in poverty. They not only owned no land, but, in some cases, even lacked sufficient clothing "to cover their bodies." They lived in the Host's *kureni* on fare ladled out by the Host or worked as hired hands in the winter quarters of the officers. It is natural that these class differences in Zaporizhzhya led to an intense struggle which in some cases reached menacing proportions. On occasion the poor Cossacks raided shops in the market place and ransacked the winter quarters of the officers, but in some instances this movement acquired a political and social character. This occurred in 1768 when the poor Cossacks rose against the newly elected officers, headed by Kalnyshevs'kyi. The mob began ransacking the houses of the officers who were forced to take refuge in the Russian entrenchment. They were later restored to power but only with the help of the Russian army.<sup>308</sup> During the investigation which followed in 1769, the Cossacks testified that they had planned to elect a new officer and to leave for Turkey

307 Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Z istorii ostannikh chasiv Zaporizhzhya" [From the History of the Last Moments of Zaporizhzhya], *Zapysky istor.-filol. vid. Ukr. Akad. Nauk*, Book IX, 1926, *passim*.

308 V. Hrekov, "Bunt siromy na Zaporizhzi 1768 r." [The Revolt of the Poor Cossacks in Zaporizhzhya in 1768], *Zap. ist.-filol. vid. Ukr. akad. nauk*, XI, 1927, 209-41.

under its leadership, taking the artillery and the Host's treasury with them. In 1769 a new mutiny broke out in the section (*kuren'*) of Korsun'; between 1770 and 1772, during the Danube campaign, a wave of uprisings of the impoverished Cossacks against their officers swept through the Host; in 1773, Colonel Kolpak was forced to escape from his own Cossacks near Kinburn.<sup>309</sup>

Constantly surrounded by "internal enemies," the officers did not consider it safe in Zaporizhzhya, the Sich, or the winter quarters, and looked for protection elsewhere. It is for that reason that they met the requirements of the Russian government. Their aim was to obtain equal rights with the Russian nobility. This had been clearly expressed by the Zaporozhian representatives to the Commission of 1767. This also explains why the destruction of the Sich proved to be such an easy operation and why the Zaporozhian officers exchanged their military titles for Russian officers' ranks and why the members were transformed into landlords of the Lieutenancy of Kate-  
rinoslav.<sup>310</sup>

The colonization of the settlements in the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" went hand in hand with the increase of the landed property of the officers class. This was not only the result of a spontaneous movement, which had been taking place for some time as settlers crossed the frontiers and occupied free land, but also the result of deliberate measures undertaken by the Cossack Camp, which imitated the New Russia authorities in that respect. For instance, when the struggle for land acquired a special intensity on Zaporizhzhya's east frontier in 1765, the Camp resolved that the territory between Tor and Izyum be settled immediately. The area involved was exactly the area which was disputed by the Zaporozhians and the Izyum district. The

<sup>309</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, pp. 357-358.

<sup>310</sup> A. V. Florovski, "Deputaty Voiska Zaporozhskogo v Zakonodatel'noi Komissii 1767 g." [Deputies of the Zaporozhian Host in the Legislative Commission of 1767], *Zapiski Odessk. ob-va istorii i drevnostei*, XXX, 1912, 344-48; Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 300.

officer Haradzha was entrusted with the colonization of this area. People from Slobids'ka Ukraine and *Het'manshchyna*, mainly peasants from landlords' estates, willingly settled there. The number of settlers was so high that a new district, Barvinkova Stinka was founded, and thickly populated villages like Kamyshevakha sprang up. A particular increase in the population of the district of Barvinkova Stinka began in 1769 in connection with the Tatar invasion of the Yelizavetgrad district, whose inhabitants had picked up and fled no matter where. The Zaporozhians skillfully exploited the situation; they seized a considerable number of abandoned estates and settled the refugees on them. When, at a later date, the landlords began to return to their manors they frequently found Zaporozhians there. This led to interminable complaints filed by the landlords with the authorities of Tor, Bakhmut and Izyum against the Zaporozhians.<sup>311</sup>

In 1765 Kalnyshevs'kyi, who at that time was in St. Petersburg as the leading member of the Cossack Camp's delegation, wrote from there that according to his information an order had been issued for the Samara Hussar regiment to settle on the Zaporozhian territory. For that reason, he continued, winter-quarters should be immediately established on the banks of the Dnepr near the rapids.<sup>312</sup> In 1768 the Camp issued an order for married Cossacks to settle along the frontier of Nova Serbiya in the settlements of Petrivka, Verblyuzhka, Kutsivka, Zelena and Zhovta.<sup>313</sup> In an order of 1772, Kalnyshevs'kyi wrote that many Zaporozhians who "do not possess their own, their fathers,' or any other hereditary lands in the Polish region, Little Russia or other countries are migrating after their marriage to the lands of the Zaporozhian Host."<sup>314</sup> Kalnyshevs'kyi proposed that these Cossacks, as well as immigrants from Poland, found settlements along

<sup>311</sup> Shimanov, *op. cit.*, p. 618.

<sup>312</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, II, 279.

<sup>313</sup> Pishchevich, "Primechaniya na Novorossiiskii krai," *op. cit.*, VIII, 128.

<sup>314</sup> *Arkhiv Kosha...*, XXXII, No. 273/291.

the Inhulets' near the mouth of the Beresihovata, so that foreigners could not invade the area and seize lands there.<sup>315</sup>

The Cossack Camp well understood the importance of developing agriculture. In 1769 it ordered that a large enough area be sowed to produce both a sufficient amount for the tiller and a surplus for sale at market. Colonels in charge of the districts were to supervise the execution of this order. Since the Camp realized that the peasants would not have enough draft animals to carry on extensive cultivation, it ordered that they be provided with oxen by the district authorities.

Towards the end of the sixties and beginning of the seventies of the century the population of Zaporizhzhya increased considerably. Various factors account for this increase, such as the growth of serfdom in the Ukraine and Russia and the suppression of the *Koliivshchyna*. This forced many to seek refuge with the Zaporozhian Cossacks, some of whom, e. g., M. Zaliznyak, took part in the uprisings. Immigrants from the New Russia province, who did not dare return to their former dwelling for fear of retribution, were numerous among these new arrivals to Zaporizhzhya. Here vast opportunities were open to them either for finding work on the new estates of the Zaporozhian officers, or for settling in the military settlements. It is true that here again a yoke would be put on their necks but it would be a lighter one than before. Not only peasants but also Cossacks, Lancers (the latter, especially after the uprising), hussars, and even foreign settlers, whose establishment had cost the Russian government considerable sums, fled to Zaporizhzhya. The flights took place either individually or in groups, amounting to the total population of several settlements, who took their cattle and possessions with them. People moved, some voluntarily, some coerced by the Zaporozhians. During the last years of Zaporizhzhya's existence, the migration of whole settlements became a daily occurrence and gives a uniqueness to the history

<sup>315</sup> M. Slabchenko, "Palankova organizatsiya Zaporozkykh vol'nostiv" [The Palanka System of the Zaporozhian Free Lands], *Pratsi kom. dlya vyuchuv. istorii zakh. rus'k. ta ukr. prava*, fasc. VI, Kiev 1929, 188.

of frontier relations between Zaporizhzhya and the New Russia province. Documents of different types, e. g., complaints of the victims and administrative reports, shed light on the continuous struggle for land and people which took place there.

We are in possession of rather important documents which characterize the hostility, the struggle, the state of constant war, which developed on the frontiers of Zaporizhzhya and the New Russia province. Extracts compiled by Potemkin's order from the reports of local commanders on damages suffered by the population at the hands of the Zaporozhians occupy a prominent place among these documents. One of these extracts, compiled by Colonel Lupul-Zverev, covers the years 1767-1774; another extract, signed by Major General Chertkov and dated April 3, 1775, covers only one year. No doubt, such material must have been of great importance to Potemkin since it made him aware of how dangerous Zaporizhzhya was to the population of the New Russia province. The first document was entitled "Extract Compiled in the New Russia Provincial Chancery, Showing the Amount of Damage Caused in the Districts and Regiments of the Province by the Pillaging and Ransacking Zaporozhians and Also Showing the Number of Servicemen, their Families, and State and Landlords' Peasants Brought to Zaporizhzhya between 1767 and July 21, 1774." It appears from this document that the damages suffered by the Catherine district amounted to 91,967 rubles, 83 kopecks and by the Yelizavetgrad district, 101,963 rubles, 19 kopecks, altogether 193,931 rubles and 2 kopecks. In the same period, 2,574 men either fled to Zaporizhzhya or were brought in by Zaporozhians from the Catherine district and 831 men from the Yelizavetgrad district, altogether 3,405 men. In addition, the document continues, entire companies of servicemen and whole settlements of landlords' peasants with their property were forcibly moved and suffered considerable damage; it was not possible to establish the number and damages for lack of data. Moreover, the Zaporozhians ousted the garrisons of 51 outposts and thus freed the way to and from Poland.



The second extract, dated 1775, gives even larger figures. It indicates that pillage and arson had resulted in damages in the Catherine district amounting to 95,133 rubles, 93 kopecks and in the Yelizavetgrad district, 232,696 rubles, 39½ kopecks. In the same period, 2,493 men were brought in from the Catherine district and 2,881 from Yelizavetgrad district, together 5,374 men.<sup>316</sup>

These are not the only documents of their kind; such extracts were drawn up monthly in various parts of the Slobids'ka Ukraine and the New Russia provinces. D. Evarnitski has published similar lists of damages; one of them refers to the Catherine and to the Yelizavetgrad district between 1772 and 1774.<sup>317</sup> An interesting feature of this extract deserves mention here. Reporting to the Governor General of the Slobids'ka province, Shcherbinin, the Izyum district chancery, points out that damages suffered by the inhabitants of the province from the Zaporozhians have been increasing since the year 1769, when the Cossacks "began to gain strength impudently and beginning with the past year, 1774, they have prevented settlers and owners from enjoying their possessions at all."<sup>318</sup>

Theoretically, damages suffered by the population were to be compensated for by decisions of the "Commission for Considering the Claims" of the population of the New Russia province in connection with damages suffered at the hands of the Zaporozhians. In practice, cases remained under consideration for several decades and payment of compensation was held up for years. For instance, Colonel Lupul-Zverev complained to Vice-Governor Tibekin in 1784 that the former Zaporozhian officers were still holding cattle robbed from the peasants which the Commission had decided should be returned to them. Lists

<sup>316</sup> *Mosk. otdel. obshchego arkhiva glavnogo shtaba*, file 1919, No. 183, sheets 6-7, 239-240.

<sup>317</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1872, 1930, 2005-2070.

<sup>318</sup> Similar materials are to be found in Tverdokhlebov, "Episod iz istorii pred-smertoi bor'by Zaporozh'iya za tsel'nost' svoikh vladanii" [An Episode of the Premortem Struggle of Zaporozh'ya for the Integrity of their Possessions], *Kiyevskaya starina*, XVI, 1886, 749; Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1978.

of damages give the impression that the life of the population must have been fraught with constant danger and fear for life and property. The list permit us to ascertain which regions were the most dangerous. These were mainly the territory of the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment and the Moldavian Hussar regiment in the Yelizavetgrad district. Raiding parties were headed, for the most part, by army clerks Moysey Chorny and Virmenko, by S. Chalyi, by Adjutant Shkola and by Sukura. Usually a Zaporozhian unit, about thirty men strong, arrived in a settlement and took the whole population away with them. The success of the raid depended upon the attitude of the inhabitants towards the Zaporozhians. It often happened that a group of twenty Zaporozhian Cossacks succeeded in bringing back twenty to twenty-five settlers' families, in other words, a group of people twice as large as the raiding unit. This first stage was often followed by a second; the inhabitants returned to their village, dismantled their houses and other buildings, loaded them on carts with their other possessions, took their cattle with them, and moved to their new settlements. In some cases, they in turn brought back the inhabitants who had stayed behind after the Zaporozhian raid. Thus, a report of the Yelizavetgrad chancery points out "that *familiyat* Prodam of the Moldavian Hussar regiment organized a mutiny of all the *familiaty* under Zaporozhian instigation and led them with all their possessions to an unknown place." In another report we find the following information: Moldavians and Ukrainians, the former inhabitants of the Fifteenth Company of the same Moldavian regiment who had gone over to the Zaporozhians, were now making raids on this company, robbing and killing, so that "the whole garrison of the company guardhouse fled for fear of these ex-hussar brigands."<sup>319</sup> About this same time, former lancers who had deserted to the Zaporozhians overran the settlement of Krasnokamyanka, killed Lieutenant Zervanyts'kyi and kidnapped ten families.<sup>320</sup> Some

<sup>319</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1896, 1897.

<sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1876.

of the inhabitants of Spars'ke fled to the Zaporozhians and, then, they returned to raid it with the Zaporozhians.<sup>321</sup>

At a later date, the Russian Government accused the Zaporozhians of having lured or forced 8,000 Moldavians into obeying their rule.<sup>322</sup> The Russian government was just in its accusation; the number of people from the Moldavian regiment in Zaporizhzhya was so high that the district of Makariv had to be founded for these fugitives in Zaporizhzhya's last years.<sup>323</sup> An interesting episode is connected with the history of the settlement of Zhovten'ka. In 1773, in the midst of the dogged struggle between the New Russia province and Zaporizhzhya, about twenty *familiyaty* and ascribed settlers from Zhovten'ka who had gone over to the Zaporozhians, persuaded Colonel Popovych and clerk Frydryk to make a raid on the settlement. The Zaporozhian raiding party of fifty-six men was joined by the fugitives who dismantled buildings in the settlement, loaded them on carts and moved them to the Zaporozhian village of Zelena. When the remaining inhabitants saw this destruction, they voluntarily moved to Zelena.<sup>324</sup>

Güldenstädt, who was traveling in the Yelizavetgrad district in 1774, gives a list of settlements whose inhabitants had gone over to the Zaporozhians, either voluntarily or under coercion. The following settlements are contained in this list: the settlement at the mouth of the Myheys'kyi Tashlyk, Komysarivka, Verblyuzhka, Zelena, Petrivka, and winter quarters in the Knyazha Balka. He reports the total number of deserters to be 700.

O. Pišćević, also gives a list of such settlements but his list differs from that of Güldenstädt. He says that Verblyuzhka, Kutivka, Petrivka, and Zelena were populated by married Zaporozhians, joined by the Lancers whom the Zaporozhians had brought

<sup>321</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1886.

<sup>322</sup> Rigel'man, *Letopisnye povestvovaniye...*, II, 33.

<sup>323</sup> *Arkhiv Kosha...*, No. 28/11.

<sup>324</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki*, II, 1888, 1893; Yastrebov, "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yeliasavety," *op. cit.*, XV, 559, 589.

there under the guise of their being relatives.<sup>325</sup> Later, when the Sich had already been destroyed, a dispute arose between Colonel Norov, the commander of the Sich territory, and Colonel Uvalov of the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment concerning Zelena. Uvalov believed that Zelena belonged to the Lancer regiment and he demanded that it provide workers for the fulfillment of various corvées. Norov objected that the settlement was not in Uvalov's jurisdiction since it had belonged to the Zaporozhians. The resolution of the case made by Governor Muromtsev in 1777 contains interesting information. It appears from the records of the commander's chancery that the settlement had been abandoned by its inhabitants during the Tatar raid of 1769 and had remained deserted until 1772. After that, it was settled by Zaporozhian Cossacks who had married in "Little Russia" and remained under the jurisdiction of the Petrova settlement until the destruction of Zaporizhzhya; there were no lancers except for four who had deserted the regiment.<sup>326</sup> In the same year, 1772, the Zaporozhians raided Odobashivka and deported six settlers and their families. They came back a few days later and deported 200 more people, completely depopulating the settlement. Twenty-six families were deported from Verblyuzhka and twenty-one from Ovnyanka.<sup>327</sup> The following figures attest to the extent of the movement of people from the New Russia province to Zaporizhzhya: For the month of August 1774, the Zaporozhians deported 185 servicemen and 66 peasants with their families from the Yelizavetgrad Lancer regiment.<sup>328</sup> In September of the same year, the Zaporozhians organized eighteen raids on the settlements of this regiment, deporting people and driving out their cattle.<sup>329</sup> Peasants unwilling to move to Zaporizhzhya were afraid of going into their fields. If plowing or harvesting made their going necessary, they went armed. They would put up

<sup>325</sup> Pishchevich, "Primechaniya na Novorossiiskii krai", *op. cit.*, VIII, 128.

<sup>326</sup> *Fond novoross. gub. kantsel.*, No. 2490.

<sup>327</sup> Evarnitski, *Istochniki...*, II, 1873, 1883.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 1819.

<sup>329</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1872, 1875.

straw dummies on high mounds resembling the Zaporozhians. When the enemy approached they set fire to them as a signal to leave work and take refuge.<sup>330</sup> Gūdenstädt points out that the Zaporozhians meted out different treatment to the various groups of the New Russia provinces's population. He observed that they were unwilling to establish relations with the Russians; therefore, he says, the inhabitants of Pokrovs'ka "are not molested although they live at the very border; this proves that the Zaporozhians are unwilling to establish relations with 'Muscovites,' as they call the Great Russians, and that Vlaks and Ukrainians go over to the Zaporozhians voluntarily rather than under pressure."

Thus Zaporizhzhya attracted thousands of fugitives from all parts of the Ukraine. Serfdom was the chief among the factors which favored the increase in the numbers of fugitives. The second half of the eighteenth century is characterized by an intensification of serfdom in the Russian Empire. The nobility had definitely secured its position as a ruling class and attempted to acquire a monopoly of ownership of land and factories. These attempts are revealed in the instructions issued to deputies to the Commission of 1767 and in the debates which took place in its meetings. In order to increase the rental value of their estates the nobility strove to increase the number of serfs tilling them. The number of "souls" (i. e., taxable male serfs) distributed to the nobility reaches its peak towards the end of the eighteenth century. An analogous process took place in the Left-Bank Ukraine. The census undertaken after Hetman Skoropads'kyi's death listed 45,000 households of *pospolyti*. During the hetmanate of Rozumovs'kyi only 4,000 people remained in that category, the remaining disappeared. They either became subjects of the officer class or fled, mainly to Zaporizhzhya. The increase in the number of serfs was accompanied by the imposition of ever heavier burdens upon them. The exploitation of the peasants became the more pronounced as the landlords attempted to extract as much profit as possible from their toil. Only a few

330 A. Kiriyafov, *Istoriko-statisticheskoye obozreniye Khersonskoi gubernii*, pp. 172-173 [Historical and Statistical Survey of Kherson Guberniya].

were content with three days of socage a week; most demanded as much as four, five or six. Agriculture brought higher profits to of the land-owning nobility, is full of advice on how to increase ed. "The Proceedings of the Free Economic Society," an organ of the land-owning nobility, is full of advice on how to increase the productivity of land and serf labor. Not content with agriculture alone, the landlords took to refining their own produce. They founded distilleries, breweries and mills for the processing of flax, wool and the spinning of thread. Almost every landlord's estate possessed auxiliary industries such as spinning, weaving, etc. Not only women but children of ten, or even eight, years of age were employed in them. According to Tuhon-Baranovs'kyi's computations, out of 328 factories in 1773, 57 belonged to the nobility and accounted for one-third of the manufacture of the Russian Empire.<sup>331</sup> The more unbearable the conditions of serfdom, the more frequent were the peasant uprisings and desertions. The deputies to the Commission of 1767 were most outspoken on this point. They requested the government to put an end to the mass desertion of peasants, to organize a search for fugitives, and to punish anyone who sheltered them. Some of the deputies even asked the government not to punish the noblemen who might flog an apprehended serf to death. In other words, they asked for the introduction of capital punishment for runaways.<sup>332</sup>

Unfortunately the data at our disposal do not permit us to outline precisely the role played by Zaporizhzhya in the peasant question, but we can be sure of its importance. V. Antonovych has shown by the example of the Kievan and Volhynia regions that the farther a landlord's estate lay from Zaporizh-

331 V. Picheta, "Pomeshchich'i krest'yane Velikorossii v XVIII v." [Landlords' peasants in Great Russia in the 18th cent.]. Dzhigeevlov, Mel'gunov, Picheta, eds., *Velikaya reforma 19 fevralya* [The Great Reform of February 19th], Moscow, II, 13-15.

332 A. Presnyakov, "Dvoryanstvo i krest'yanskii vopros v nakazakh" [The Nobility and the Peasant Question in the Instructions], *ibid.*, II, 200.

zhya, the heavier were the burdens of the serfs working it.<sup>333</sup> We have to assume that the same situation prevailed in the Left-Bank Ukraine as well. A document left by a landlord of the Slobids'ka province depicts the unsettled conditions of the estates of the region. The landlord was in constant fear that his peasants might desert him.<sup>334</sup> Complaints of peasant desertions, submitted by large landowners of the Slobids'ka province, such as Donets'-Zakharzhevs'kyi, Krasnokuts'ki, Kapustyans'ki and Rudnev give a clear picture of the situation. Replying to these complaints in 1773, the Slobids'ka provincial chancery addressed a memorandum to Governor General Shcherbinin, asking him to protect the landlords from the Zaporozhians who were luring peasants and peopling whole settlements with fugitive landlord and state peasants.<sup>335</sup> It is understandable that the landlords should nourish a profound hatred towards the Zaporozhians and Zaporizhzhya itself in whose limitless steppes their serfs were disappearing. This feeling of merciless hatred was reflected in a considerable number of works of literature of the nobility of the second half of the eighteenth century. Thus, the well-known historian G. Müller points out in a note composed by order of Count N. Panin that the Zaporozhians were founding large settlements and their officers were becoming more prosperous.<sup>336</sup> The same idea is expressed with even more clarity in another note, which complains that the Zaporozhians are luring peasants and have already settled 25,000 households with peasants whom they have made into their subjects. Their officers comprised many

<sup>333</sup> V. Antonovich, "Akty ob ekonomicheskom i yuridicheskom polozenii krest'yan v XVIII st." [Acts Relating to the Economic and Legal Status of Peasants in the 18th Century], *Arkhiv Yugozapadnoi Rossii* [Archives of Southwestern Russia], VI, v. II.

<sup>334</sup> *Trudy imperatorskogo vol'nogo ekonomicheskogo oöshchestva* [Proceedings of the Imperial Free Economic Society], VIII, 129.

<sup>335</sup> Shimanov, *op. cit.*, p. 617.

<sup>336</sup> Müller, "Kratkaya zapiska o malorossiiskom narode i zaporozhtsakh" [A Short Note on the Little Russian People and on the Zaporozhians], *Chteniya*, 1846, Book 1, p. 68.

well-to-do people who had estates, manors and industries of their own.<sup>337</sup> This attitude is also reflected in the "Short Description of Little Russia" in which the author lists the reasons which led to the destruction of the Sich. He says, among other things, that the Zaporozhians had derived a profit of several hundred thousand rubles from ransacking the New Russia province and that they had settled up to fifty thousand families from whom they were collecting a great revenue. The authorities in St. Petersburg attached great importance to the hoarding of riches by the Zaporozhians. In 1775 a Cossack delegation staying in Petersburg wrote to Kalnyshevskiy that Potemkin had made the accusation "that Your Worship is allegedly having fashionable chambers outfitted for himself such as have never existed there (i. e., in the Sich). All Zaporozhians are considered to be very rich, and especially Your Worship who has recently sold 14,000 sheep in the Crimea at two rubles a piece. We were told this by Potemkin himself."<sup>338</sup>

The manifesto of August 3, 1775 to the destruction of the Sich is of great importance in understanding the Russian government's attitude towards Zaporozhzhya. It is interesting that it should have been published two months after the event itself, when Zaporozhzhya had already been incorporated into the provinces of New Russia and Azov, its officers exiled, and their property confiscated. The manifesto of the third of August is not only a document registering the abolition of the Sich but also a publicistic pamphlet which bares the motives lying behind its destruction and justifies, as it were,

<sup>337</sup> A. Lazarevski, "Zaporozh'ye v kontse XVIII st." [Zaporozhzhya at the End of the 18th Century], *Arkhiv istoricheskikh i prakticheskikh svedenii otnosyashchikhsya do Rossii* [Archive of Historical and Practical Information Relating to Russia], Kalachev, ed., St. Petersburg, 1861, Book II, pp. 11-14; Lazarevski, "Zaporozhe v kontse XVIII v." [Zaporozhzhya at the End of the 18th Century], *Kiyevskaya starina*, XXVII, 1889, 623-629; also, V. Kashpîrev, *Pamyatniki novoi russkoi istorii* [Documents of Modern Russian History], St. Petersburg 1872, II, 295-310.

<sup>338</sup> Skal'kovski, *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*, III, 172.



the measures of the Russian government. At the same time, the manifesto attempts to inculcate certain opinions and convince the reader that the very existence of Zaporizhzhya constituted a grave danger to the whole Russian Empire, and more than that, to the welfare of its subjects.<sup>339</sup>

Although the manifesto was proclaimed two months after the destruction of Sich, it contains a considerable number of contradictions. In one passage it is said that the Zaporozhians gave shelter to "rabble," that they subsisted on robbery, living in a state of "complete idleness, abominable drunkenness and despicable ignorance" and they never possessed any property. But in another passage we read that they had founded winter quarters, moved people from the Hussar and Lancer regiments, and settled 8,000 people on their territory. They had seized lands between the Southern Bug and the Dnestr, subjected the population of the Moldavian regiment, and attempted to reconquer the territory of the New Russia province by force of arms. They were receiving married people with their families, establishing their own system of agriculture and achieving great success in that endeavor since up to fifty thousand peasants tilled the soil in the steppes. The manifesto ended with the following conclusions:

Any sound-thinking person may easily grasp how cunning were the plans of the Zaporozhian Cossacks and how considerable the damages caused by them to the state. In establishing their own system of agriculture, they were destroying the foundations of their dependence upon Our Throne and ultimately intended to constitute themselves as a completely independent area in the midst of the Fatherland, an area under their own fiendish rule, hoping that the inclination towards dissolute life and robbery would continually renew and replenish their numbers, given the opulence in the interior of their territory.

This could bring about the depopulation of neighboring areas and prove a menace to the trade which has had all chances for development here, "to the envy of the whole world."

<sup>339</sup> Polons'ka-Vasylenko, "Manifest 1775 r...", *op. cit.*, vol. XII.

The manifesto levels two accusations at the Zaporozhians which mutually exclude one another. They are treated as robbers, drunkards, vagabonds, sluggards who prove an obstacle to trade and, generally speaking, to the civilized life of neighboring nations. On the other hand, they are accused of having established a large-scale economy, founded winter quarters, settlements and raised cattle; it was also held against them that peasants flocked to them by the thousands and that Zaporizhzhya was becoming dangerous to neighboring lands, menacing them by depopulation. Similarly, the manifesto accuses the Zaporozhians of having founded a "bachelors' society," whereas in another passage it reproaches them for settling married Cossacks.

The manifesto, in addition to expressing the hostile attitude of the Russian government, states clearly the reasons which made the continued existence of Zaporizhzhya impossible. It had outlived its usefulness as a barrier against the Tatars and the Turks, and it had become a foreign body surrounded by Russian provinces. Its unique socio-political order was an anachronism among the possessions of autocratic Russia and its wide fields constituted a continuous danger for the development of Russian landownership based on serfdom.

The destruction of Zaporizhzhya was an event of enormous importance in the life of eighteenth century Ukraine. With it a militant society of Ukrainian knights ceased to exist, one which had, for three centuries, defended the Ukraine from its implacable enemies, a protection which had made the development of Ukrainian economic and cultural life possible. What is no less important, Zaporizhzhya's end meant the disappearance of the force which had constantly opposed the reduction of the Ukrainian peasantry to serfdom. As long as Zaporizhzhya lived, the landlord dared not burden the peasant with too heavy a yoke, since the wide steppes of Zaporizhzhya, from which a fugitive would never return, stood open. The introduction of serfdom into the Ukraine which occurred in 1783 was possible only after the destruction of Zaporizhzhya.

Many years have passed and the vices of Zaporizhzhya's life have been forgotten; yet, the memory of the Ukrainian nation cherishes only the virtues of Zaporizhzhya, recalling it as the protector of the Ukraine against all its enemies, as "the wide steppe, the joyful land," where everyone found shelter, help and freedom.



## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Despite the interest and importance of the period studied for the history of the Southern Ukraine, it has been but little investigated up to the present time. This statement is especially valid with reference to the second half of the period, following the creation of the province of New Russia.

A limited amount of information can be derived from the notes of earlier historians. Solov'yev's *Istoriya Rossii* and Skal'kovski's *Khronologicheskoye obozreniye istorii Novorossiiskogo kraya* contain a great deal of material, but both authors were able to devote only a few pages to the history of the Southern Ukraine in the period with which we are concerned. More rewarding is A. Skal'kovski in his *Istoriya Novoi Sechi*. The history of the Serbian settlements attracted the attention of the historians more than did the province of New Russia. It has been treated in articles by A. Velitsin in *Russkii Vestnik*, by N. A. Popov in *Vestnik Yevropy*, and in a series of articles and notes published by A. A. Andriyevski in *Kiyevskaya Starina*. An article by the Archimandrite Arseni, "Sofronii Dobrashevich — Arkhimandrit Novoi Serbii" appeared also in *Kiyevskaya Starina*. During the years 1910-1911, E. O. Zahorovski published his work, "Slavyanskaya kolonizatsiya Novorossiiskogo kraya" in *Voyenno-istoricheskii Vestnik*.

Even less attention has been paid to the history of the province of New Russia. Besides the general works of S. M. Solov'yev and A. Skal'kovski, we have only the article by D. P. Miller, "Pikineriya" (*Kiyevskaya Starina*), which, however, touches upon only one special point.

The situation becomes more favorable when we turn to the publications of source materials. Besides such an important source as the *Polnoye Sobraniye Zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii*, we have at our disposal a series of other important publications. The *Senatskii Arkhiv*, vols. VII-XV, deserves to be mentioned in the first place. It contains the minutes of the Senate meetings during which the problems concerning Nova Serbiya, Slavyano-serbiya, and the province of New Russia were discussed. Un-

fortunately, this publication stops at the year 1765. Of great value to the scholar are the numerous works by A. Andriyevski, such as the "Materialy dlya istorii Yuzhno-russkogo kraia XVIII st.", *Istoricheskiye materialy izvlechennyye iz arkhiva kiyevskogo gubernskogo pravleniya*, "Relyatsii kiyevskogo general-gubernatora za 1768 i 1769 gg", and finally a series of documents printed in *Kiyevskaya Starina*. These publications contain interesting factual material concerning the colonization of the region, mostly in connection with the struggle between the Zaporozhian Cossacks and the government for land.

Of importance to the history of the colonization of the Southern Ukraine are the following collections of documents published by the academician D. I. Evarnitski (Yavornytskyi) : *Istochniki dlya istorii zaporozhskikh kozakov*, vols. I-II, *Sbornik materialov po istorii Novorossiiskogo kraia*.

The archival documents of the fortress of St. Elizabeth are of great importance for the history of the region. They have been published by V. Yastrebov (in *Zapiski odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, vol. XV). A series of publications of sources of a less documentary character also deserves mention here, such as M. Ternovski, "K istorii Zaporozhskogo kraia" published in *Vestnik Yekaterinoslavskogo zemstva* in 1904, which contains very valuable, although carelessly edited, material; P. Ivanov, "Materialy po istorii Zaporozh'ya XVIII st. (*Zapiski odessk. obshch. istorii i drevnostei*, vol. XX), V. Hrekov, "Bunt siromy na Zaporizhzhzi 1768 r". The valuable documentary material contained in two monographs, one by A. Skal'kovski—*Istoriya Novoi Sechi*—and the other by Bishop Feodosi, *Materialy dlya istoriko-statisticheskogo opisaniya Yekaterinoslavskoi yeparkhii* also belongs here. In the latter work, documents collected by the author in diocesan archives are quoted in full or in part. They help to establish dates for the foundation of churches in the *sloboda* of the Southern Ukraine. These documents, valuable as proof of the existence of a given privileged community, contain additional indications, often exactly dated, as to the time of the foundation of the *sloboda*, the identity of the founder and the former inhabitants of the locality.

The *Sbornik imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* which contains materials on the work of the Commission on Codification (or Legislation) of 1767 is of paramount importance for the history of the province of New Russia. Vol. 93 furnishes a collection (unfortunately incomplete) of the decrees for the province of New Russia; vols. 8, 32 and others contain the minutes of the meetings of the Commission at which deputies from the province took part.

Eighteenth century memoirs form a group apart. First place among the diaries, rather limited in number, belongs to S. S. Piščević (Pishchevich) "Izvestiye o pokhozhdenii. . ." (*Chteniya* 1881-1883, and also as a separate book). In this work the author gives an extraordinarily colorful contemporary picture of the foreign colonization of Nova Serbiya, Slavyanoserbiya. He also characterizes the leaders of the settlement movement. "Primechaniya na Novorossiiskii krai" written by the son of the foregoing, A. S. Piščević, forms an appendix to the father's work. A fragment of the memoirs of Baron Tott on the Tatar invasion of the district of Yelizavetgrad yields some interesting information. For a later period (1774) we have a very interesting description of the region by Gldenstdt.

Of course, only the principal publications have been indicated here, no attempt has been made to give a full bibliography of the question. Yet, from this brief survey of works devoted to the period under discussion, it readily appears that it has attracted little attention. Therefore, archival rather than printed documents have constituted the source materials for the present work.

The principal sources for the period under consideration are concentrated in the Historical Archives of Dnepropetrovsk. They contain a huge amount of documents pertaining to the history of the Southern Ukraine from the fifties of the 18th century on, specifically the collection of the Chancery of the New Russia Army Corps. Despite their unique importance, these materials have not yet been adequately exploited. They have been published in part by M. Ternovski, V. Hrekov, and recently by K. Huslysty ( *Z istorii selyans'kykh rukhiv na Ukraini* ). Thousands of lengthy files, however, still await the researcher.

The Arkhiv Tavricheskogo upravleniya gosudarstvennykh imushchestv has been of no less importance for the present work. The files of the surveying expeditions undertaken on behalf of the office of the governor of Yekaterinoslav were found there. They contain decisions of the tracing of territorial boundaries, both of the *slobody* and of lands granted to private individuals, applications for allotments of land, complaints against arbitrary seizures of land and unjust surveying, statistical data, etc.

Very interesting material is to be found in various archives of Kiev. The Kiev Central Archives of Ancient Documents preserves the records of the Chancery of the governor of Kiev to which Nova Serbiya was subject for some time and which was in continuous relations with the province of New Russia. The manuscript division of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences contains even more valuable material, as it preserves a collection of manuscripts, formerly in the possession of O. M. Lazarev'skyi concerning the colonization of the region in the 18th century, as well as the extremely valuable records of the St. Elizabeth fortress, published by V. Yastrebov.

I have been able to extract a quantity of interesting information from the Arkhiv Kosha Zaporozhskikh Kozakov where the documents from the 1730s are preserved. Often they illustrate life in the Zaporozhian "Free Lands" and also throw some light on the relations between the Zaporozhians and their neighbors, the inhabitants of Nova Serbiya and the province of New Russia.

Exceptionally interesting material is contained in the manuscript collection of the former *Obshchestvo istorii i drevnostei* of Odessa, now in the Historical Museum of that city. It comprises several thousand documents, preserved mostly in 19th century copies, illustrating the colonization and history of the region.

I was fortunate enough to find some quantitatively small, but very valuable material in the Moscow section of the Archives of the General Staff (formerly Archive Lefort).



Closing the survey of sources utilized in the present work, I may mention my own collection of documents containing the correspondence of Khorvat and of other administrators of Nova Serbiya with their neighbors, the governors of the province of Smila. It yields much valuable factual information on the conditions of life in Nova Serbiya.

N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### I. Archives

- Arkhiv Kosha Zaporozhskikh Kozakov (Archives of the Camp of the Zaporozhian Cossacks).
- Arkhiv tavricheskogo upravleniya gosudarstvennykh imushchestv (Archives of the Tauride Office of State Properties).
- Biblioteka Ukrain'skoi Akademii Nauk—Rukopysnyi viddil (Library of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences—Manuscript Division):
- Arkhiv kriposty sv. Yelizavety* (Archives of the Fortress of St. Elizabeth)
  - Kopii dokumentiv XVIIIst.* (Copies of Documents of the 18th Cent.)
  - Zbirka O. M. Lazarevskoho* (Collection of A. M. Lazarevski)
  - Zbirka Sudiyenka—portfel' Poletyki* (Collection of Sudiyenko—Folder of Poletika).
- Dnipropetrovskiy Istorychnyi Arkhiv (Historical Archives of Dnepropetrovsk)
- Fond Novoserbskogo korpusa* (Collection of the New Serbia Corps).
  - Fond Novorossiiskogo korpusa* (Collection of the New Russia Corps).
- Fond Novorossiiskoi Gubernskoi Kantselyarii (Archive collection of the New Russian provincial chancelry).
- Instytut Arkheolohii Ukrain'skoi Akademii Nauk (Archeological Institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences)
- Kopiyi spravy—arkhiv Bakhmutskoi zavodskoi kantselyarii* (Copies of Documents—Archives of the Office of the Bakhmut Breeding Farm).
- Kiyevskii Tsentral'nyi Arkhiv Davnikh Aktiv (Central archives of Ancient Documents [deeds] of Kiev) (KTsADA):
- Fond General'noi Viys'kovoi Kantselyarii* (Collection of the General Military Chancelry)
  - Fond Kiyevskoi Gubernskoi Kantselyarii* (Collection of the Kiev Provincial Chancelry).
- Rukopysna zbirka istorychnoho tovarystva Nestora Litopystysya* (Manuscript Collection of the Historical Society of Nestor the Chronicler).
- Moskovskii otdel obshchego arkhiva Glavnogo Shtaba (Moscow Section of the Archives of the General Staff).
- Odes'kyi istorichnyi muzei (Odessa Historical Museum)
- Rukopisnyi sbornik byvshego odesskogo otdela obshchestva istorii i drevnostei* (Manuscript collection of the former Odessa division of the society for history and antiquities) also in Ukrainian form: *Rukopysna zbirka odes'koho tovarystva...*
- Sbornik razlichnykh dokumentov otnosyashchikhsya k yuzhnoi Rossii* (Collection of various documents pertaining to Southern Russia).
- Zbirka dokumentiv N. D. Polons'koi-Vasylenko* (Collection of documents of N. D. Polons'ka-Vasylenko)—private collection of the author. Last heard of when evacuated to Ufa during the World War II together with materials of the Academy of Sciences.

II. *Serials and Journals*

- Arkhiv Gosudarstvennogo Soveta* (Archives of the Council of State) St. Petersburg 1869-1904.
- Arkhiv istoricheskikh i prakticheskikh svedenii odnosyashchikhsya do Rossii izd. Kalachevym* (Archives of Historical and Practical Information Concerning Russia—ed. by Kalachev), St. Petersburg 1859-1869.
- Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rossii—izdavayemyi komissiyeyu dlya razbora drevnikh aktov, sostoyashchei pri kiyevskom, podolskom i volynskom general-gubernatore* (Archives of South Western Russia—published by the Commission for the Disposal of Ancient Deeds established by the governor-general of Kiev, Podolia, and Volhynia) Kiev 1859-1914.
- Chteniya v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri moskovskom universitete* (Readings in the Imperial Society of Russian History and Antiquities at the University of Moscow), Moscow 1846-1849, 1858-1918.
- Chteniya v istoricheskome obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa* (Readings in the Historical Society of Nestor the Chronicler, Kiev 1873-1914, 24 vols.
- Dzhivelev, A. K., Mel'gunov, S. P., Picheta, V. I. (eds), *Velikaya Reforma 19-go fevralya* (The Great Reform of February 19th), Moscow 1911, 6 vols.
- Izvestiya kiyevskogo universiteta* (Notes of the University of Kiev) Kiev 1867-1919.
- Kharkovskii sbornik* (Kharkov collection), 1891.
- Khersonskiyeh yeparkhial'nye vedomosti* (Kherson Diocesan News).
- Letopis' yekaterinoslavskoi arkhivnoi komissii* (Chronicle of the Yekaterinoslav Archival Commission).
- Kiyevskaya Starina* (Kievan Antiquities), Kiev 1882-1906.
- Materialy dlya otsenki zemel' khersonskoi gubernii po zakonu 8 iyunya 1893 g* (Materials for the Assessment of the Lands of the Kherson Province on the Basis of the Law of June 8, 1893) Kherson 1901 ff.
- Otechestvennye zapiski* (Fatherland Notes), St. Petersburg 1883-1884; *Polnoye Sobraniye zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii* (Complete Collection of the Laws of the Russian Empire), 1st series 1649-1825, St. Petersburg 1830-1839.
- Pratsi komisii dlya vyuchuvannya istorii zakhidno-rus'koho ta ukrains'koho prava* (Proceedings of the Commission for the Study of the Western Russian and Ukrainian Law [Zbirnyk sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoho viddilu, Ukrains'ka Akademiya Nauk] Kiev 1927, 1929.
- Pratsi komisii sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Ukrainy* (Proceedings of the Commission on the Social and Economic History of the Ukraine), I, Kiev 1932 [Narysy z sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Ukrainy] (Sketches of the social and economic history of the Ukraine).
- Russkaya starina* (Russian antiquities), St. Petersburg 1870-1917.
- Russkiye zapiski* (Russian notes), St. Petersburg 1915-1917.

- Russkii arkhiv* (Russian archives), Moscow 1863-1916.
- Russkii biograficheskii slovar'* (Russian Biographical Dictionary) St. Petersburg 1896-1918.
- Sbornik imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* (Collection of the Imperial Russian Historical Society), St. Petersburg 1867-1916.
- Sbornik khar'kovskogo istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva* (Collection of the Khar'kov Historico-Philological Society) Khar'kov 1886-1907.
- Sbornik moskovskogo glavnogo arkhiva Ministerstva Inostrannykh Del* (Collection of the Central Moscow Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Moscow 1880-1900, 7 vols.
- Sbornik statei yekaterinoslavskogo nauchnogo obshchestva* (Collection of Articles of the Yekaterinoslav Scientific Society).
- Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov* (Collection of Military Historical Materials).
- Senatskii arkhiv*, St. Petersburg 1888-1913, 15 vols.
- Trudy imperatorskogo vol'nogo ekonomicheskogo obshchestva* (Proceedings of the Imperial Russian Society for Military History), St. Petersburg 1909-1912, 6 vols.
- Trudy imperatorskogo vol'nogo ekonomicheskogo obshchestva* (Proceedings of the Imperial Free Economic Society), St. Petersburg 1765-1915.
- Uchenye zapiski vysshei shkoly goroda Odessa* (Learned Notes of the College of the City of Odessa), Otdel gumanitarno-obshchestvennykh nauk (Section of Humanities and Social Sciences) Odessa 1922.
- Ukraina—naukovi tr'okhmisyachnyk ukrainoznavstva* (Ukraine—trimensual Scientific journal for Ukrainology), Kiev 1917 ff.
- Ukrains'ka Akademiya Nauk, istorychna sektsiya—Naukovi zbirnik za rik...* (Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Historical Section—Scientific Collection for the year...), Kiev 1926, 1927-1929 [published as part of the *Zapysky istorychnoi sektsii Vseukrains'koi Akademii Nauk* (Notes of the historical section of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences) vols. 19, 26, 28-32].
- Ukrains'kyi arkhiv* (Ukrainian archives), Kiev 1929-31, 4 vols.
- Vestnik yekaterinoslavskogo zemstva* (Courier of the Yekaterinoslav zemstvo).
- Vestnik Yevropy* (Courier of Europe), St. Petersburg 1866-1918.
- Voskhod* (Dawn), St. Petersburg 1881-1905.
- Yekaterinoslavskii yubileinyi listok* (Yekaterinoslav Jubilee Pamphlet), Yekaterinoslav 1887.
- Zapiski imperatorskogo odesskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostei* (Notes of the Imperial Society of History and Antiquities of Odessa), Odessa 1839-1919.
- Zapiski Novorossiiskogo universiteta* (Notes of the University of New Russia), Odessa 1867-1913 (?)

- Zapysky istorychno-filologichnoho viddilu ukrains'koi akademii nauk* (Notes of the Historico-Philological Section of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences), Kiev 1919 ff.
- Zapysky naukovooho tovarystva imeny Shevchenka* (Notes of the Shevchenko Scientific Society) L'vov 1892 ff.
- Zbirnyk prats' yevreis'koi istorychno-arkheografichnoi komisii* (Collection of Proceedings of the Jewish Historico-Archeographical commission), II, Kiev 1928-1929 [No. 73 of *Zbirnyk istorychno-filologichnoho viddilu Ukr. Akad. Nauk*].

### III. Secondary Sources

- Anonymous "Materialy dlya istorii khersonskoi yeparkhii" (Materials for the History of the Kherson Diocese), *Khersonskiy yeparkhial'nye vedomosti*, No. 14, 1878.
- "Perepiska grafa Rumyantseva o vosstanii na Ukraine," (Correspondence of Count Rumyantsev Concerning the Revolt in the Ukraine) *Kiyevskaya Starina*, III, 1882, pp. 523-551; IV, 1882, pp. 89-118; VII, 1883.
- "Presledovaniye laptei kolonizatorami Novorossii" (Campaign against Bast Shoes by the Colonists of New Russia), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, XV, 1886, pp. 754-756.
- "Serby v Kiyeve 1753-1754" (Serbians in Kiev 1753-1754), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, XI, 1885, pp. 381-385.
- "Heneral'ne slidstvo pro mayetnosti Lubens'koho polku" (General Investigation of the Possessions of the Lubny Regiment), *Ukrains'kyi arkhiv*, IV, Kiev 1931.
- Spiski naseleennykh mest yekaterinoslavskoi gubernii* (Lists of the Inhabited Places in the Yekaterinoslav Province), 1863.
- Aleksandrov, G. "Istoricheskiye svedeniya o snosheniyakh Rossii s Chernogoriyeyu" (Historical Information on the Relations of Russia with Montenegro), *Russkii Arkhiv*, XIV, No. 2, 1876, pp. 257-270.
- Andriyevski, A. A., *Istoricheskiye materialy izvlechenyye iz kiyevskogo gubernskogo pravleniya* (Historical Materials Extracted from the Kiev Provincial Administration), 8 fasc., Kiev 1882-1885.
- , "Relyatsii kiyevskogo general-gubernatora za 1768 i 1769 gg." (Reports of the governor-general of Kiev for 1768 and 1769) *Chteniya v istoricheskoy obshchestve imeni Nestora Letopistsya*, vol. VII, pp. 73-211.
- , "Materialy dlya istorii yuzhno-russkogo kraya v XVIII st. izvlechenyye iz starykh del kiyevskogo gubernskogo arkhiva" (Materials for the History of South Western Russia in the 18th Cent. Extracted from Ancient Documents in the Kiev provincial archives) *Zapiski odesskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XVI, Odessa 1886—separate offprint.
- Antonovich, V., "Akty ob ekonomicheskoy i yuridicheskoy polozenii krest'yan v XVIII st." (Documents on the Economic and Legal Position of the Peasants in the 18th Cent.), *Arkhiv yugo-zapadnoi Rossii*, VI.

- Arkhiv Zaporoz'koi Sichi, Opys materiyaliv* (Archives of the Zaporozhian Sich, List of Materials), Kiev (Tsentral'na Arkhivna Uprava—arkheografichna komisiya), 1931.
- Arsenii, Arkhimandrit, "Sofronii Dobrashevich—Arkhimandrit Novoi Serbii" (Sophonius Dobrashevich—Archimandrite of New Serbia) *Kiyevskaya Starina*, X, 1884, pp. 276-304.
- Bagalei, D. (ed), "Dnevnik puteshestviya po slobodskoi ukrainskoi gubernii akademika Gil'denshtedta" (Diary of a Journey in the Slobodskaya Ukrainian Province of the Academician Gldenstdt), *Khar'kovskii sbornik*, 1891.
- Bagalei, D. (Bahaliy), *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii stepnoi okrainy moskovskogo gosudarstva* (Sketches of the History of the Colonization of the Steppe Frontier of the Muscovite State), Moscow 1887.
- Bahaliy, D. *Istoriya slobids'koi Ukrainy* (History of the Slobids'ka Ukraine), Kharkov 1918.
- Bantysh-Kamenski, D. N., *Istoriya Maloi Rossii* (History of Little Russia), St. Petersburg (?) 1882.
- Barvinski, V. A., *Krest'yane levoberezhnoi Ukrainy XVII-XVIII vv.* (Peasants of the Left-Bank Ukraine in the 17th and 18th Cent.) Kharkov 1909.
- Bil'bassov, V. A., *Istoriya Yekateriny II* (History of Catherine II), St. Petersburg 1885, 2 vols.
- Bogumil, A., "K istorii upravleniya Novorossiyeyu Potenkinym" (On the History of Potemkin's Government of New Russia), *Letopis' yekaterinoslavskoi arkhivnoi komissii*, fasc. II.
- Dashkevich, N. P., *Obshcheniye yuzhnoi Rusi s yugo-slavyanami* (Contacts of Southern Russia with Southern Slavs).
- Den, V. E., *Naseleniye Rossii po III-i revizii* (Population of Russia According to the third Census).
- "Ekstrakt o novoserbskom byvshem poselenii i o polkakh gusarskom i pandurskom pod komandoy Khorvata uchrezhdennykh" (excerpt Concerning the Former New Serbian Settlement and the Husar and Pandur regiments Established under the Command of Khorvat) *Sbornik voyenno-istoricheskikh materialov*, fasc. XVI.
- Evarnitski, D. I., "Chislo i poryadok zaporozhskikh sechei" (Number and order of the Zaporozhian Siches), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, VIII, 1884, pp. 599-609.
- Evarnitski, D. I., *Istochniki dlya istorii zaporozhskikh kozakov* (Sources for the History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks) Vladimir 1903,
- , *Istoriya zaporozhskikh kozakov* (History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks), St. Petersburg 1895,
- , *Sbornik materialov dlya istorii zaporozhskikh kozakov* (Collection of Materials for the History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks), St. Petersburg 1888,
- , *Vol'nosti zaporozhskikh kozakov* (The "Liberties" of the Zaporozhian Cossacks), St. Petersburg 1896.

- Feodosi, *Istoricheskii obzor pravoslavnoi khristianskoi tserkvi v predelakh nyneshnei yekaterinoslavskoi gubernii do vremeni formal'nogo otkrytiya eye* (Historical Survey of the Orthodox Christian Church of the Present-day Province of Yekaterinoslav prior to its Formal Establishment), Yekaterinoslav 1876,
- , *Materialy dlya istoriko-statisticheskogo opisaniya yekaterinoslavskoi yeparkhii* (Materials for an Historico-statistical Description of the Yekaterinoslav Diocese), Yekaterinoslav 1890.
- Florovski, A. V., "Deputaty Voiska Zaporozhskogo v Zakonodatel'noi Komissii 1767 g" (Deputies of the Zaporozhian Host in the Codification Commission of 1767), *Zapiski odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XXX (1912), pp 329-377,
- , *Sostav zakonodate'noi komissii za 1767-1774 gody* (Composition of the Commission on Codification for the years 1767-1774) Odessa 1915.
- Galagan, G., "Malorossiiskii vertep" (Little Russian Puppet Show), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, IV, 1882, pp 1-38.
- Gavriil, Preosv., *Otryvok povestvovaniya o novorossiiskom kraye* (Excerpt of a Report on the New Russia Region), part II.
- Gessen, Yu. I., *Zakon i zhizn'* (Law and Life), St. Petersburg 1911.
- Golovinski, P., *Slobodskiy kozach'i polki* (Sloboda Cossack Regiments), St. Petersburg 1864.
- Güldenstädt, J., *Reisen durch Russland und im Caucasischen Gebürge*, St Petersburg 1791.
- Hnatyuk, V., "Znosny ukraintsiv iz serbamy" (Relations between Ukrainians and Serbs), *Naukovyi zbirnyk prysuyachenyi profesorovi M. Hrushevskomu* (Collection of Scholarly Essays Dedicated to Professor M. Hrushevsky), L'vov 1906.
- Hrekov, V., "Bunt siromy na Zaporizhzi 1768 r" (Rebellion of the Siroma in Zaporizhzhya in 1768), *Zapysky istoriko-filologichnoho viddilu Ukrain'skoi Akademii Nauk*, IX, 1927, pp. 209-241.
- Huslysty, K., *Z istorii klasovoi borot'by v stepovii Ukraini* (From the History of the Class Struggle in the Steppe Ukraine), 1932.
- Ivanov, P. A., "Delo o vykhodyashchikh iz zagranitsy novorossiiskoi gubernii zhidakh" (Affair of the Jews Coming from Beyond the Borders of the New Russia Province), *Zapiski odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XVII, pp 163 ff.
- Ivanov, P., "Materialy po istorii Zaporozh'ya XVIIIst" (Sources on the History of Zaporizhzhya in the XVIIIth cent.), *Zapiski odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XX (1897) part 2, pp 59-100.
- Kashpircv, V. *Pamyatniki novoi russkoi istorii* (Monuments of Modern Russian sentyabrya 1758 o pereselenii serbov v Rossiyu" (Excerpt from the Minutes of the Governiong Senate of 18 September 1758 Concerning the Resettlement of Serbs in Russia), *Russkii Arkhiv*, VII 1869, No. 5, pp. 737-740.



- Kashpîrev, V. *Pamayatniki novoi russkoi istorii* (Monuments of Modern Russian History), St. Petersburg 1871-73, 3 vols.
- Kir'yakov, V., *Istoriko-statisticheskoye obozreniye kherscnskoi gubernii* (Historico-statistical Survey of the Kherson Province).
- Klauss, I., *Nashi kolonii. Opyty i materialy po istorii i statistike inostrannoi kolonizatsii v Rossii* (Our Colonies. Essays and Materials on the History and Statistics of Foreign Colonization in Russia), fasc. I, St. Petersburg 1869.
- Kniga dlya chteniya po istorii narodov SSSR* (Book for Readings on the History of the Peoples of the USSR), I.
- Koniski, G., *Istoriya Rusov, ili Maloi Rossii* (History of Rus' or of Little Russia), Moscow 1846.
- Korolenko, P. P., "Materialy po istorii Voiska Zaporozhskogo" (Materials on the History of the Zaporozhian Host), *Sbornik ihar'kovskogo istoriko-filologicheskogo obshchestva*, IX, 1897, pp. 140-182.
- Kostomarov, N., "Materialy dlya istorii Koliivshchiny ili rezni 1768 g." (Materials on the history of the *koliivshchina* or the massacre of 1768), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, III, 1882, pp. 297-321.
- Krypyakevych, I. "Serby v ukrains'komu viys'ku" (Serbians in the Ukrainian Army), *Zapysky naukovoogo tovarystva imeny Shevchenka* CXXIV (L'viv 1920).
- Laskovski, *Material dlya inzhenerenogo iskusstva v Rossii* (Material on the Engineering Art in Russia), St. Petersburg 1861-65.
- Lazarevski, A. M., "Zaporozh'e v kontse XVIII st." (Zaporozhians at the End of the 18th Cent.), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, XXVII, 1889, pp. 623-627.
- Lazarevski, A. M., "Istoricheskiye ocherki poltavskoi Lubenshchiny" (historical sketch of the Lubny region in Poltava province), *Chteniya v istoricheskoy obshchestve Nestora Letopistsy*, vol. XI, 1896, part II, pp. 34-203.
- , "Lyudi staroi Malorossii" (People of Old Russia), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, I, 1882, pp. 101-126, 479-499,
- , "Zaporozhtsy v kontse XVIII st." (Zaporozhians at the End of the 18th Century) *Arkhiv istoricheskikh i prakticheskikh svedenii otnosyashchikhsya do Rossii*, St. Petersburg 1861, bk 2, pp. 5-14.
- Lileyev, M. I., *Iz istorii raskola na Vetke i v Starodub'ye XVII-XVIII vv* (From the History of the Raskol on the Vetka and in the Starodub Region), fasc. 1, Kiev 1895.
- Lobachevski, V., "Bugskoye kozachestvo i voyennyye poseleniya" (The Bug Cossacks and Military Settlements), *Kiyevskaya Starina* XIX, 1887, 591-628.
- Maksimovich, G. A., *Vybory i nakazy v Malorossii* (elections and instructions in Little Russia), Kiev 1917.
- Manshtein (C. H. von Manstein) *Zapiski Manshteina o Rossii 1727-1744* (Notes of Manstein about Russia 1727-1744), St. Petersburg 1875 [also: Manstein, C. H. von, *Memoirs of Russia from 1727 to 1744*, 2d ed. London 1773].

- Manzhura, I., "Kartinka vvedeniya yekaterininskikh poryadkov v zaporozhskom kraye" (Picture of the Introduction of Catherine's Regulations into the Zaporozhian Area), *Yekaterinoslavskii yubileinyi listok*, Yekaterinoslav 1887, part 2.
- Markevich, A., "Gorod Kachibei ili Gadzhibei—predshestvennik goroda Odessy" (The city of Kachibei or Gadzhibei—Precursor of the City of Odessa), *Zapiski Odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XVII (1894), part 2, pp. 1-72.
- Miller, D. P., "Pikineriya" (lancers), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, LXVII, 1899, 301-322.
- Miller, G. F., (Müller, G. F.) *Istoricheskiye sochineniya o Malorossii. Rassuzhdeniya o zaporozhtsakh* (Historical Works on Little Russia. Considerations on the Zaporozhians), Moscow 1846,
- , "Kratkaya zapiska o malorossiiskom narode i zaporozhtsakh" (Brief Note on the Little Russian People and the Zaporozhians) *Chteniya v imperat. obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, 1846, bk. I, pp. 57-68.
- Myakotin, V. A., "Ocherki sotsial'noi istorii Malorossii" (Sketches of the Social History of Little Russia), *Russkiye Zapiski*, Jan-Nov. 1915.
- , *Ocherki sotsial'noi istorii Ukrainy v XVII-XVIII vv.* (Sketches of the Social History of the Ukraine), vol. I, fasc. 1-3, Prague 1924-26.
- Myshetski, "Istoriya o kozakakh zaporozhskikh, kak onye iz drevnikh let zachalisya, i otkuda svoje proiskhozhdeniye imeyut, i v kakom sostoyanii nyne nakhodyatsya" (History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks, How They Arose in Olden Times, and From Where They Trace Their Origin, and In What Condition They Find Themselves Today), *Chteniya*, VI (1847), Miscellany, pp. 1-42 (edited by O. Bodyanski who, erroneously, attributes it to Rigel'man—cf. N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko in *Zbirnyk na poshanu akad. D. Bahaliya*, Kiev 1927).
- Nadkhin, Gr., *Pamyat' o Zaporoh'i* (In Memory of Zaporizhzhya), Moscow 1879.
- Nikolaichik, F., *Gorod Kremenchug* (City of Kremenchug), St. Petersburg 1891.
- Nolde, Boris, *La Formation de l'Empire russe*, vol. II, Paris 1953.
- Novitski, Ya., *Istoriya goroda Aleksandrovskaya* (History of the City of Aleksandrovskaya)
- , *Zaporozhskaya i malorossiiskaya starina v pamyatnikakh ustnogo tvorchestva* (Zaporozhian and Little Russian Antiquity in the Monuments of Oral Creation).
- P[adalka], L. (L. P.), "Proiskhozhdeniye zaporozhskogo kazachestva" (Origin of the Zaporozhian Cossacks), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, IX, 1884, 580-613, X, 1884, pp. 27-52.
- Patenko, S., "Gorod Novomirgorod, yego khramy i dukhovnoye upravleniye" (The City of Novomirgorod, Its Churches and Ecclesiastical Administration), *Pribavleniye k Khersonskim yeparkhial'nym vedomostyam*, No. 13, 1880.
- Picheta, V., "Pomeshchich'ikrest'yane Velikorossii v XVIII v." (Landowners' Peasants of Great Russia in the 18th Century), in *Velikaya Reforma 19-go fevrala*, II, Moscow 1911 pp. 1-24.

- Pishchevich, A., "Primechaniya na Novorossiiskii krai" (Additional Notes on the New Russia Region), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, VIII, 1884, pp. 111-135.
- Pishchevich, S. S., "Izvestiye o pokhozhenii..." see below under Popov, N. (ed).
- Polons'ka-Vasylenko, N. D., "Mayno zaporiz'koi starshyniy yak dzhereho dlya doslidzhennya sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Zapo:rizhzhya" (The Possessions of the Zaporozhian *starshyna* as a Source for Study of the Social and Economic History of the Zaporizhzhya), *Pratsi komisii sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Ukrainy* [Narysy z sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Ukrainy], vol. I, Kiev 1932, pp. 43-206,
- , "Manifest 3 serpnya roku 1775 v svitli tohochasnykh idei" (The Manifesto of 3 August 1775 in the Light of Contemporary Ideas), *Zapysky istorychno-filologichnoho viddily Ukr. Akad. Nauk*, XII, 1927, pp. 165-203.
- , "Materiyaly do istorii hirnychoi promyslovo-sty Donbasu" (Materials for the History of the Mining Industry of the Donbas), *Pratsi komisii sotsiyal'no-ekonomichnoi istorii Ukrainy*, I, Kiev 1932, pp. 201-229,
- , "Pershi kroky yevreis'koi kolonizatsii v pivdernih Ukraini" (First Signs of Jewish Colonization of the Southern Ukraine) *Zbirnyk prats' yevreis'koi istorychno-arkheohrafichnoi komisii*, II, Kiev 1929, pp. 83-115,
- , "Z istorii ostannikh chasiv Zaporizhzhya" (From the History of the last Moments of the Zaporizhzhya), *Zapysky istorychno-filologichnoho viddily Ukr. Akad. Nauk.*, IX, 1926, pp. 278-331.
- Popov, N. (ed), "Izvestiye o pokhozhenii Simeona Stepanova syna Pishchevicha", *Chteniya imperat. obshch. istorii i drevnosti rossiiskikh pri moskovskom universitete*, 1881 No. 4, pp. 1-320; 1882, No. 2, pp. 321-479; 1883, No. 2, pp. 480-561 (abbreviated to: "Izvestiye o pokhozhenii...").
- Popov, Nil A. "Voyennye poseleniya serbov v Avstrii i Rossii" (Military settlements of the Serbs in Austria and in Russia) *Vestnik Yevropy*, 1870, bk. VI, pp. 584-614.
- Presnyakov, V. "Dvoryanstvo i krest'yanskii vopros c nakazakh" (The Gentry and the Peasant Question in the Instructions), in *Velikaya reforma 19-go fevralya*, I, Moscow 1911, pp. 191-203.
- Rigel'man, A. I., *Letopisnoye povestvovaniye o Maloi Rossii* (Chronicle Report on Little Russia), Moscow 1847.
- Rozhdestvenskii, V. Ya., *Sluzhiloye zemlevladieniye v Moskovskom gosudarstve XVI st.* (Service Land Ownership in the Muscovite State of the 16th Century), St. Petersburg 1897.
- Rusov, A. A., article, title unknown, in *Materiyaly dlya otsenki zemel' khersonskoi gubernii*, (Aleksandriiskii uyezd), III.
- Semevski, V. I., "Razdachi naselennykh imenii pri Yekaterine II" (Grants of Inhabited Estates under Catherine II), *Otechestvennye Zapiski*, vol. 233, (Aug. 1877) pp. 204-227.
- Shch[ekatorov], A. *Slovar' geograficheskii rossiiskogo-gosudarstva* (Geographical Dictionary of the Russian State), Moscow 1804, 3 vols.

- Shcherbina, V. I., "Kiyevskiy voyevody, gubernatory i general-gubernatory" (Voivodes, Governors, and Governor-generals of Kiev), *Chteniya v istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora Letopistsya*, vol. VI, Kiev 1892, part II, pp. 123-148.
- Shcherbina, V. I., "Dva kyivs'ki general-gubernatory pershoi polovyny XVIII" (Two Governor-generals of Kiev of the First Half of the 18th Century), *Naukovyi Zbirnyk*, Kiev 1924.
- Shimanov, A. "Predsmertnaya bor'ba zaporozhtsev" (Pre-mortem Struggle of the Zaporozhians), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, 1883.
- Shmidt, A. *Materialy dlya statisticheskogo opisaniya rossiiskoi imperii. Khersonskaya guberniya* (Materials for the Statistical Description of the Russian Empire. The Kherson Province) vol. I, St. Petersburg 1863.
- Shpilevski, M. M., "Politika narodonaseleniya v tsarstvovaniye imperatritsy Yekateriny II" (Settlement Policy in the Reign of Empress Catherine II), *Zapiski Novorossiiskogo universiteta*, VI, 1871, pp. 1-178.
- Skal'kovski, A. A., *Bolgarskiye kolonii v Bessarabii i Novorossii* (Bulgarian Colonies in Bessarabia and New Russia), Odessa 1848,
- , "Yeshche o Bugskikh kozakakh" (More on the Cossacks of the Bug), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, IV, 1882, 598-602,
- , *Istoriya Novoi Sechi, ili poslednego kosha zaporozhskogo na osnovanii podlinnykh dokumentov zaporozhskogo sechevogo arkhiva* (History of the New Sich, or of the Last Zaporozhian Camp, on the basis of Genuine Documents of the Zaporozhian Sich Archives) 3rd ed., Odessa 1885-1886,
- , "Kak sudili i ryadili zaporozhtsy" (How the Zaporozhians Conducted Justice and Concluded Contracts) *Kiyevskaya Starina*, XIV, 1886, pp. 604-621,
- , *Khronologicheskoye obozreniye istorii novorossiiskogo kraya*, (Chronological Survey of the History of the New Russia Area),
- , "Neskol'ko dokumentov iz istorii gaidamachiny" (Some Documents on the History of the Haydamak Movement) *Kiyevskaya Starina*, XIII, 1885, 277-318,
- , *Opyt statisticheskogo opisaniya novorossiiskogo kraya* (Essay of Statistical Description of the New Russia Area), Odessa 1850,
- , "Rumynskiye doblesti" (Romanian Achievements), *Zapiski odesskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, (1897) pp., 28-49,
- , "Russkiye dissidenty Novorossii" (Russian Dissidents in New Russia), *Kiyevskaya Starina* XVII, 1887, 771-782.
- Slabchenko, M. "Familiaty i zastupayuchi" (Familiaty and Substitutes). *Uchenyye zapiski vysshei shkoly goroda Odessy*, (otdel gumanitarno-obshchestvennykh nauk), II, 1922, pp. 81-84,
- , "Palankova organizatsiya Zaporoz'kykh vol'nostiv" (Organisation of the Fortified Places of the Zaporozhian Free Lands), *Pratsi komisii dlya vyuchuvannya istorii zakhidno-rus'koho ta ukrains'koho prava*, fasc. VI, Kiev 1929, pp. 158-252.

- "Sotsiyal'no-pravna orhanizatsiya Zaporoz'koi Sichi" (Social and Legal organization of the Zaporozhian *Sich*) *Pratsi komisii dlya vyuchuvannya istorii zakhidn'o-rus'koho ta ukrains'koho prava*, fasc. III, Kiev 1927, pp. 203-340.
- Sokolov, G. "Istoricheskaya i statisticheskaya zapiska o voyennom gorode Yelisavetgrade" (Historical and Statistical Note on the Military Town of Yelizavetgrad), *Zapiski odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, II, pp. 384ff.
- Solov'yev, S. M., *Istoriya Rossii* (History of Russia), 6 books, St. Petersburg (izd. Obshchestvennaya Pol'za) 1894-1896.
- Stanislavski, S., "K istorii kolonizatsii" (On the History of Colonization), *Sbornik statei yekaterinoslavskogo nauchnogo obshchestva*, 1904,
- , "K istorii kolonizatsii yevreyev v Novorossii" (On the History of the Colonization of Jews in New Russia), *Voskhod*, bk. 9, 1887.
- Tatarchevski, A., "Puteshestviye i deyatel'nost' barona Totta v kachestve konsula v Krymu v 1767 g." (Journey and Activities of Baron Tott as consul in the Crimea in 1767), *Izvestiya kiyevskogo universiteta*, XIII (October 1873), part 2, 1-24.
- Ternovskii, N. N., "K istorii zaporozhskogo kraia" (On the History of the Zaporizhzhya Area), *Vestnik yekaterinoslavskogo zemstva*, 1904.
- Tkachenko, M., "Utvorennya Novoi Serbii" (Establishment of New Serbia), *Ukraina*, 1926, No. 2-3.
- Tverdokhlebov, "Epizod iz istorii predsmertnoi bor'by Zaporozh'ya za tsel'nost' svoikh vladenii" (An Episode from the pre-mortem Struggle of Zaporizhzhya for the Integrity of its Possessions), *Kiyevskaya Starina*, XVI, 1889, pp. 749-756.
- Tyshchenko, M. F., *Fondy ustanov Kyivshchyny KTsADA* (Collections of Documents of the Kiev Region in the KTsADA), Kiev 1929.
- Velitsyn, A. A., "Inostrannaya kolonizatsiya v Rossii" (Foreign Colonization in Russia), *Russkii Vestnik*, vol. 200, January 1889, pp. 155-177; February 1889, pp. 3-32.
- Yastrebov, V., "Arkhiv kreposti sv. Yelisavety" (Archives of the Fortress of St. Elizabeth), *Zapiski odessk. obshchestva istorii i drevnostei*, XV, 1889, pp. 548-593,
- , "Grekii v Yelisavetgrade" (The Greeks in Yelizavetgrad), *Kiyevskaya Starina* VIII, 1884, pp. 673-684,
- , "Pesnya o serbe" (The Song about the Serb), *Kiyevskaya Starina* X, 1884, pp. 757-758.
- Yastrebov, V., review of "Izvestiye o pokhozhdenii S. S. Pishchevicha", *Kiyevskaya Starina*, X, 1884, pp. 312-328.
- Yefimenko, P. S., "Kal'nishhevskii: poslednii koshevoi zaporozhskoi sechi 1691-1803" (Kal'nishhevskii: the Las Koshevoi of the Zaporozhian *Sich*), *Russkaya Starina*, XVI, 1875, No. 3, pp. 405-420.

Yunakov, N., "Dokumenty Severnoi Voyny (Documents of the Northern War), *Trudy imperat. russkogo voyenno-istoricheskogo obshchestva*, III,  
Zagorovski, E. O., "Slavaynskaya kolonizatsiya Novorossiiskogo kraia", *Voyenno-Istoricheskii Vestnik*.

Zarul'ski, S., "Zamechaniya do Maloi Rossii prinadlezhashchiye", (ed. by O. Bodynski), *Chteniya*, IV 1848, No. 1, part 2, pp. 1-55.

#### IV *General works on the Ukraine in English*

Allen, W. E. D. *The Ukraine*, Cambridge University Press, 1940.

Cresson, W.P. *The Cossacks, Their History and Country*, New York, 1919.

Doroshenko, D. *History of the Ukraine*, Edmonton, 1939.

Halecki, O. *Borderlands of Western Civilization*, New York (Ronald), 1952.

Hrushevsky, M. *A History of the Ukraine*, Yale Univ. Press, 1941.

Strakhovsky, L. I. *Handbook of Slavic Studies*, Harvard Press 1949, (see especially the article "The Ukraine" by Oliver J. Frederiksen, pp. 346-366 and his bibliography).

## A NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

The following transliteration system of the Research Program on the U.S.S.R. has been used in this work. All other numbers of *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.* will follow the simplified system (see *The Annals* Vol. IV, No. 3, p. 1053).

<i>Russian</i>	<i>Ukrainian</i>
А а а	А а а
Б б б	Б б б
В в в	В в в
Г г г	Г г г
Д д д	Д д д
Е е е	Е е е
Ё ё ё	yo
Ж ж ж	zh
З з з	z
И и и	i
Й й й	i
К к к	k
Л л л	l
М м м	m
Н н н	n
О о о	o
П п п	p
Р р р	r
С с с	s
Т т т	t
У у у	u
Ф ф ф	f
Х х х	kh
Ц ц ц	ts
Ч ч ч	ch
Ш ш ш	sh
Щ щ щ	shch
Ъ ъ	omitted
Ы ы ы	y
Ь ь ь	'
Э э э	e
Ю ю ю	yu
Я я я	ya
	ИЙ ий yi
	І і і
	Ї ї ї
	К к к
	Л л л
	М м м
	Н н н
	О о о
	П п п
	Р р р
	С с с
	Т т т
	У у у
	Ф ф ф
	Х х х
	Ц ц ц
	Ч ч ч
	Ш ш ш
	Щ щ щ
	Ь ь ь
	Ю ю ю
	Я я я

## EDITOR'S NOTE

This work represents intensive research into the settlement of a certain area of the Ukraine during the period 1750-1775. To a great extent it was based on source material and, as such, it will be of interest to historians of East Europe.

The author, Natalya Dmytrovna Polons'ka-Vasylenko is a well-known Ukrainian historian, whose specific field of interest is the history of South Ukraine and Zaporizhzhya. She graduated from the St. Volodymyr University of Kiev and immediately started her research work as historian and archaeologist. In 1916 she became an associate professor of the St. Volodymyr University, later a full professor. She was associated with the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev.

After World War II M-me Polons'ka-Vasylenko actively participated in the work of Ukrainian scholarly organizations in the Free World. Professor Polons'ka-Vasylenko has more than 100 publications in the field of the history of Ukraine. She now resides in Germany, where she is a full member of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences.



# INDEX

## LIST OF PERSONAL NAMES

- Adabash, N. S. see Odobash  
Akatsatov, Georgi — Court Councillor, 95  
Akhmet-Aga — Turkish emissary, 15  
Akseniys — physician, 195  
Akulyna — priest's wife, 315  
Albanos, Ivan — major, 40  
Albans'ki — lieutenant, 236, 237, 249  
Aleksandrov, G. — author, 107  
Alternats'kyi — captain, 136  
Alymov, Aleksii — second-major, colonel of Lancer rgt., 184, 196-198, 240, 286, 287  
Anatolius — bishop of Melet, 106  
Andriy — shepherd, 152  
Andriyevski, A. A. — author, 9, 22, 25, 27, 30-32, 35, 36, 39, 77-79, 104, 113, 164, 172, 173, 177, 241  
Anne (Anna Ioanovna) — empress of Russia, 1730-1740, 11, 14, 219  
Antonov — Old Believer, 239  
Antonovych, V. — author, 326, 327  
Apochynin (Opochynin) — brigadier, commander of Perevolochna, 33  
Apostol, Danylo P. — Hetman of Ukraine, 1727-1734, 22, 24, 32  
Apraksin, F. A. — count, 160, 241  
Arapov, Yegor — quartermaster of St. Elizabeth, major, 88, 222  
Arapova — wife of preceding, 222  
Arkani, George — second major, 99  
Arsenii — arkhimandrite, 59, 61, 97, 174, 232  
Augustus II — king, 11  
Avramenko — captain, 137, 149, 232  
Bahalii, D. — author, 34, 245, 247  
Bakhtin — captain, 190  
Baki — sergeant, 260  
Balashev, Tymofey — merchant, 263  
Balugin — settler, 239  
Bamberger, David — Jewish merchant, 264  
Bamberger, Leo — Jewish merchant, 264  
Bantysh-Kamenskii, D. — author, 11, 41  
Baratov — princes, landowners in New Russia, 185, 224, 240  
Barzhiniy, Rani — recruiting agent, 239  
Bashkovych — major, 250  
Bast — architect, 69  
Batory, Stefan — king, 5, 6, 30, 37, 291  
Baydak — captain, 229  
Belezlii, Mikhail — merchant, 258, 260, 266  
Berezhans'ki — lieutenant, captain, 197, 229, 230  
Bestuzhev-Ryumin, M. P. — count, ambassador to Vienna, 42, 43, 46-48, 169  
Bezridnyi — cossack, 295  
Bibikov, A. I. — second major, colonel, 49, 71, 102, 164, 190, 302  
Bielfeld — economist, 200  
Bil'basov, V. — author, 201  
Bilyi — Zaporozhian officer, 315  
Bogdanov — officer of Nova Serbiya, 232  
Boldyrev — salter of Bakhmut, 120  
Bondariv — settler, 239  
Bondariv, Sevastiyan — merchant, 263  
Borovski — first major, 194, 196  
Bosquet, de (Debosket) — colonel of the Corps of Engineers, 28, 36, 50, 55  
Bozhdarovych — major, 295  
Bozhych — name of family, 41  
Brandt, Jacob von (Fon Brandt) — major general, Commander in Chief of New Russia, 193, 302, 303  
Branicki — counts, 52  
Branicki, Franz Xavier Petrovich — count, Polish Crown Hetman, 54  
Brink — major general, 68

- Browne (Broun) — count, field-marshal, governor general of Livonia, 264
- Bukreyev — captain, landowner in New Russia, 224
- Bulat-Agu — Turkish emissary, 67
- Bulatsel', Grigori — captain, second major, lieutenant colonel, 95, 96, 119, 170, 194, 196
- Bulgakov — landowner in New Russia, 224
- Burckhardt (Burgardt) — architect, 194
- Butovych, Grigori — regimental secretary and judge, 133, 136, 147
- Butovych — captain, brother of preceding, 141
- Buzeskul — settler, 232
- Bykov, Nikita — captain, 128, 130, 138, 139
- Byzewski — Polish *starosta*, 52
- Bytyahovs'kyi — colonel, landowner, 185
- Catherine II — empress of Russia, 1762-1796, 56, 173, 181, 182, 190, 194, 200-202, 211, 216, 233, 248, 253, 261-264, 283, 288, 298, 300, 302, 308-311
- Chalyi, S. — Zaporozhian officer, 322
- Charles XII — king of Sweden, 7
- Chechelya, Joseph — captain, 135
- Chechuliy — lieutenant, 250
- Chelevan, Trokhym — recruiting agent, 239
- Chernikov, Nicholas — second major, 196, 197
- Chernyshev, Zakhari G. — count, 182, 301-303, 305-307
- Chernstov — major general, 79, 80
- Chernyavs'ki, Nazar — regimental secretary, 133, 134
- Chernychenko, Vasyl' — settlement agent, 146
- Chertkov — brigadier, 229, 230
- Chertkov, Vasilii Alekseyevich — general. Commander in Chief of Slobidska province, 189, 194, 198, 199, 209, 232, 280, 282, 320
- Chicherin, N. I. — major general, 79
- Chorba — lieutenant, 93
- Chorba, Nicholas — first major, 98, 99
- Chorba, Peter — recruiting agent, 240
- Chorba, Theodore — colonel, 196
- Chorba, Theodore — captain, 42, 98
- Chorny, Moysay — army clerk, 322
- Chorny, Terentiy — mayor of St. Elizabeth, 161
- Chuhuyevets', Ivan — Secretary of the Zaporozhian Host and commissioner for border affairs, 73, 131, 133, 134
- Chyhyrynets' — settlement agent, 239
- Danilevski — physician, 197
- Dankovski — physician, 220
- Dashkevich, N. — author, 40
- Dedenyev — general, 189
- Delyatyns'ky — captain, 138
- Den, V. — author, 248
- Denisov — wife of colonel Denisov, 224
- Denysiv — ensign, 287, 288
- Derevans'kyi — lieutenant, 131
- Derkach — colonel, 64
- Devlet-Ali-Oglu — Turkish emissary, 67
- Dobrashevich, Sophronius — archimandrite, 59, 60, 86, 97, 174
- Dobryanski — governor of Smila, 55, 60, 118, 119, 156
- Dobrytskyi — merchant, 260
- Dokuchayev — factory owner, 152
- Dolgoruki — prince, commander of Russian army, 34, 249, 299, 300, 311
- Donets', Nicholas — lieutenant and settlement agent, 136, 141, 146
- Donets'-Zakharzhevs'ky — landowner, 327
- Doni — officer of New Russia, 261
- Dubrovski — captain, 194
- Duvig, I. — lieutenant colonel, commander of St. Elizabeth, 198, 199
- Dyk, Paul — captain, 135, 136, 153, 232
- Dyk, Yakiv — lieutenant, 131, 136
- Elizabeth (Yelizaveta Petrovna) — empress of Russia, 1741-1761, 17, 18, 25,

- 28, 30, 31, 33, 37, 48, 50, 52, 90, 97, 117, 124, 126, 127, 136, 138, 152, 154, 155, 163, 201
- Erdeli — name of family, 232
- Euler, L. (Eiler) — mathematician, 311
- Evarnitski (Yavornyts'ki), D. — author, 5-7, 9-15, 17, 20, 21, 25, 26, 30-33, 36-39, 50, 64, 71, 74, 75, 91, 159, 166, 174, 181, 193, 250, 291-295, 311, 315, 321-324
- Faune — agent of Louis XV of France, 262
- Fedorenko, Danylo — ensign, 162
- Fedoriv, Filip — Zaporozhian Camp Leader (*koshovyi otaman*), 316
- Fedorov — lieutenant, 250
- Fedorykha, Varvara — inhabitant of Perevolochna, 33
- Feodosii (Theodosius) — bishop, author, 20, 39, 71, 72, 127, 146, 239, 244, 247, 253-255, 279-281, 295, 298, 312
- Filipovych — sergeant, 109
- Filipovych — colonel, settlement agent, 250
- Finiks, von (Fon Finiks) — lieutenant colonel, 77, 123, 164
- Fizhin — merchant, 265
- Fliverk — privy councilor, chief of Bakhmut, 196, 197, 217
- Florovski, A. V. — author, 232, 288, 317
- Floryns'kyi — captain, 288
- Frederick-Augustus — prince pretender to the crown of Poland, 11
- Frizel' — (G. G. Friesel) — colonel commander of St. Elizabeth, 87, 88, 198
- Frydryk — Zaporozhian army secretary, 323
- Fundukliy — merchant, 260
- Furman — captain, 194
- Fursov — merchant, 265
- Galagan, H. — author, 175
- Georgiyev — lieutenant, 229
- Georgiyev — settler, 232
- Gering — major, commander of St. Elizabeth, 194, 198
- Gerlich — second major, 240
- Gessiy, K. I. — lieutenant colonel, commander of St. Elizabeth, 198
- Glebov, A. L. — brigadier, commander of St. Elizabeth, 58, 86, 88, 90, 91, 104, 159
- Glebov, Ivan Fedorovich — major general, commander in Chief of Nova Serbiya, 49, 51, 52, 55, 57, 63, 67, 68, 79-84, 89, 91, 94, 102, 103, 108, 115, 127-134, 138, 143, 144, 147, 152, 155, 159, 161, 163-165, 182, 292, 302, 303
- Glebov, I. I. — colonel, 198
- Golitsyn, M. M. — prince, field marshal, 9
- Golovkin, G. J. — count, state chancellor, 22
- Goncharov — manufacturer, 160, 241
- Grachev — second major, land commissioner, 235, 260
- Gran — colonel, 136
- Gredeskul — settler, 232
- Grekov — otaman, 166
- Grigoriyev — merchant, 265
- Güldenstädt — academician, author, 58, 62, 69, 70, 173, 191, 192, 243, 247, 254, 261, 282, 290, 323, 325
- Gur'yev — colonel, commander of St. Elizabeth, 88
- Gur'yev — geodosist, 128
- Haradzha — Zaporozhian officer, 312, 318
- Hehela, Andriy — captain, 152
- Hehela, Vasyl' — captain, 135
- Hladkyi, Danylo — Zaporozhian delegate, 73
- Hloba — secretary of the Cossack Host, 5, 312-314
- Hnatyuk, V. — author, 40, 174
- Holovatyi — judge of Cossack Host, 312, 314
- Holubenko — salter's apprentice, 120

- Homon, Ivan — mayor of St. Elizabeth, 161, 162
- Horbatiy — mason, 60, 156
- Hordiyenko, Kost — Cossack Camp leader, 7
- Horlenko — colonel, 38, 114, 186
- Hrab'yanka — colonel, 23
- Hrekov, V. — author, 316
- Hrydyn — recruiting agent, 64
- Hryhor'yev — provost, 160
- Hudovych, — adjutant to Peter III, 93
- Huk — colonel, 35
- Ibrayev, Chula — prince, commander of Meshcheryaks, 166
- Ihnatovych — Zaporozhian Camp leader, 316
- Irman, A. A. — colonel, commander of St. Elizabeth, 198
- Isakov, Aleksandr Stepanovich — major general, civil governor of New Russia, 193, 194, 199
- Iuzbash — see Yuzbash
- Ivan V. — tsar of Russia, 1682-1696, 6
- Ivanchenko — captain, 152
- Ivanchenko, Ivan — mayor of St. Elizabeth, 161
- Ivanets'kyi — recruiting agent, 240
- Ivanov — name (not otherwise identified), 170, 232
- Ivanov — captain, 229, 230
- Ivanov, Daniel — chancelry secretary, 95
- Ivanov, Konstantin — second major, 260, 261
- Ivanov, P. — author, 17, 50, 264
- Justi, Johannes H. G. von — economist, 200
- Kabuzan, Ivan — merchant, 162
- Kabuzan, Yas'ko — merchant, 162
- Kalachev, N. — author, 104
- Kalmaz — captain, 139
- Kalnyshevs'kyi, Petro — last Zaporozhian Camp Chief, 73, 190, 248, 299, 301-303, 305, 307, 311-318, 328,
- Kamenev — merchant 263
- Kapnist, Vasyl P. — colonel, 23, 24, 28-30, 32, 36, 59, 64, 128
- Kapustyanski — landowner, 327
- Karachun — captain, company commander, 100, 101, 109, 170, 173, 232, 261
- Karavanets' — Cossack, 313
- Kasay — captain, 160
- Kashpnev, V. — author, 328
- Keyserling, Herman Karl (Keizerling) — count, Russian ambassador in Vienna, 46
- Khajnowski — Polish nobleman, 224
- Khalkidons'ki — first major, commander of St. Elizabeth, 198
- Khotyaintsev — lieutenant, 59
- Khmel'nyts'kyi, Bohdan — Hetman of Ukraine, 1648-1657, 5, 30, 37, 73, 74, 291, 309
- Khorvat, Anton — lieutenant colonel, 95, 98, 99
- Khorvat, Dmitri — brother of Ivan Samoylovich Khorvat, 42
- Khorvat, Ivan — lieutenant colonel, son of Michael Khorvat, 99, 109, 165
- Khorvat, Joseph — son of Ivan Khorvat, 95, 96
- Khorvat, Michael — lieutenant colonel, brother of Ivan Samoylovich Khorvat, 99
- Khorvat, Nicholas — brother of Ivan Samoylovich, 42
- Khorvat of Kurtich, Ivan Samoylovich — Nova Serbiya chief, 42-65, 76-102, 105-119, 123-132, 142, 143, 146, 150, 151, 154-161, 164-171, 174, 177, 178, 182, 192, 196
- Kir'yakov, A. — author, 56, 325
- Kit, Grigori — cossack, 137
- Kit, Ivan — sub ensign, 138
- Klauss, A. — author, 62, 115, 116, 205, 251
- Kiyashka — captain, commander of Black Hussar rgt., 198

- Kneskov — merchant, 313  
 Kochkonih — cossack, deputy of Kre-  
 menchug, 287  
 Kochubey, S. V. — quartermaster gen-  
 eral, 32, 184, 234, 304  
 Kolpak — colonel, 312, 315, 317  
 Kolyubakin — captain, 17  
 Komburley — recruiting agent, 240  
 Konstantinov, Aleksandr — captain, lt.  
 colonel, 98, 119, 170, 232  
 Kontsarevich, Simeon — bishop, 97, 105,  
 109  
 Kontsarevich, Vasili — lieutenant, 105,  
 109  
 Korbe — captain, 222  
 Korf, Kh. G. — colonel, commander of  
 St. Elizabeth, 198, 229, 232  
 Korzh — cossack, 154  
 Koshovenko, Vasyl' — captain, 135  
 Koshyyan — salter, 120  
 Kostomavov, N. — author, 241, 263  
 Kostyuryn, I. I. — vice governor of Kiev,  
 78, 85, 104, 168  
 Kotenko, Michael — sub ensign, 138  
 Kotlyar — burgess of St. Elizabeth, 163  
 Koval' — burgess of St. Elizabeth, 162  
 Koval'chuk — cossack, 21  
 Kovalevs'kyi, Ivan — priest, 224  
 Kovbasa — salter, 120  
 Kozel'ski — major, deputy of the gen-  
 try, 283  
 Kozyr — cossack, 295  
 Krasnoglazov — merchant, 258, 266  
 Krasnokuts'ki — landowner, 327  
 Krokhmal', Paul — sub-ensign and mer-  
 chant, 153, 260  
 Krypiakevych, I. — author, 40  
 Kryvydidenko — **salter**, 120  
 Krzychynski — recruiting agent, 239  
 Kucherov — otaman, 137  
 Kukhar, Ivan — business partner of  
 Fedorenko, 162  
 Kupchenko — sub ensign, 160  
 Kurakin, P. M. — count, 159  
 Kurdyumov, Afanassi — merchant, 265  
 Kurdyumov, Aleksei — merchant, 265  
 Kutsyi — Zaporozhian officer, 315  
 Kuz'menko — inhabitant of Krasna, 153  
 Kyshka — captain, 259  
 Lachinov — lieutenant general, com-  
 mander in chief of Nova Serbiya, 84  
 Lantskoror.s'kyi, Prestlav — Hetman, 6  
 Lazarevs'kyi, O. M. (A. M.) — author,  
 21, 22, 41, 117, 125, 126, 135, 155, 328  
 Lebedyns'kyi, Semen — captain, 135  
 Leont'yev — surveyor, 74  
 Leont'yev, Mikhail Ivanovich — gen-  
 eral, governor general of Kiev, com-  
 mander in chief of New Russia, 27,  
 38, 78, 193  
 Leszczynski, Stanislaw — king of Poland,  
 11, 12  
 Levashev, N. I. — Russian plenipoten-  
 tiary in Constantinople, 262  
 Levchenko — salter, 120  
 Levul — second major, 99  
 Lezhen' — servant, 119  
 Lileyev, M. — author, 26, 145  
 Litvinov, Joachim K. — collegiate as-  
 sessor, colonel, 130-132, 134  
 Lobachevski, V. — author, 252, 253  
 Logachev — second major, landowner,  
 224  
 Lomonosov, Michael — Russian scien-  
 tist, 200  
 Lopukhin, V. A. — general en chef,  
 governor general of Kiev, 79, 83, 166  
 Loskutov, Yegor — merchant, former  
 peasant, 160, 241, 265, 266  
 Lozovyi — salter, 120  
 Louis XV — king of France, 262  
 Lubomirski (Lyubomirski) — princely  
 family of Poland, 52  
 Lubomirski — prince, 54  
 Lukyanov — Zaporozhian officer, 296  
 Lupandin — geodesist, 128  
 Lupul-Zverev, Vasili — colonel, 129, 198,  
 253, 254, 296, 320, 321

- L'vivs'kyi, Pylyp — Zaporozhian officer, 190, 299
- Lyakh, Khoma — captain, 135
- Lysanevych — lieutenant, 142
- Lysyak — sub ensign, 138
- Lyzander — colonel, 295
- Lyzohub — landowner, 32
- Machebelov — colonel, 224
- Makohin, Ivan — ensign, 133
- Maksimov — merchant, 265
- Maksimov — second major, 197, 279
- Maksymovych, G. — author, 288
- Malashevych — Zaporozhian Camp Chief, 13
- Malyugin, Ivan — burgess, former peasant, 160
- Manshtein (Manstein) C. H. — author, 34, 246
- Manzhura, I. — author, 287
- Maria-Theresa — empress of Austria, 1745-1780, 42
- Markevych, A. — author, 262
- Markov, Ivan — captain, 106
- Maryanovych — lieutenant, 240
- Maslennikov — merchant, 266
- Mavroyeni — captain, 314
- Mayakovs'kyi — also known as Demyan Virmenko, army clerk, 290
- Mazepa, Ivan — Hetman of Ukraine, 1687-1709, 7
- Mel'gunov, Aleksei Petrovich — lieutenant general, commander in chief of Nova Serbiya and of New Russia, 68, 84, 94, 132, 143, 150, 182, 185, 193, 217, 243, 248, 250, 256, 261, 264, 286, 287, 293
- Menshikov, A. D. — prince, generalissimo of Russian army, 34
- Menzelius (Mentselius), Ludwig Johann — major, lieutenant colonel of Corps of Engineers, 66, 68, 69, 89, 132
- Meshcherski — prince, lieutenant general, commander in chief of Nova Serbiya, 83, 100, 166
- Mikhailovich — Khorvat's relative, 170
- Milutinovich — archimandrite, 173
- Molchans'kyi — new name of Polish nobleman V. Movchan, 136
- Morenets', Maksym — deputy of Yelizavetgrad Lancer rgt., 285-288
- Moroz, S. — deputy of settlers, 258, 286-288
- Movchan — recruiting agent, 159
- Movchan, Vasyly' — lieutenant (new name: Molchanski), 136, 159
- Müller, G. F. (Miller, F. I.) — historian, 6, 11, 301, 327
- Münnich, C. A. (Minikh) — field marshal, 11, 18, 28
- Münster (Minster) — name, 235
- Murav'yov, M. A. — brigadier, commander of Sc. Elizabeth, 52, 68, 75, 86-88, 91, 93, 117, 129, 130, 131, 134, 136, 137, 140, 141, 143, 146, 147, 151, 152, 292
- Muromtsev — governor of Kiev, 324
- Musin-Pushkin — ensign, 190
- Myakotin, V. — author, 41, 218
- Mykha'ylo — miller, 237
- Mykhalcha, V. A. — quartermaster, lt. colonel, 131, 133, 135, 148, 260
- Mykhalych — captain, 103
- Mykhaylovych — first major, 230
- Mykhaylovych — colonel, 229, 230
- Mykukha — adjutant of Zaporozhian cossacks, 314
- Myloradovych — landowner, 41, 185
- Myrolyub — assistant to colonel Filipovych, 250
- Myshets'ki — prince, author, 9-11, 21
- Nadkhyn, Hr. — author, 312
- Nakoval'ski — captain, 190
- Naryshkin — major general, 84, 311
- Naydenko — cossack, 153
- Nedilko-Voynov — captain, 136
- Nedilko-Voynov, Nicholas — sub ensign, son of preceding, 138

- Nelyubov, Maksim — chief auditor, 95, 96
- Neplyuyev, I. I. — Russian minister resident in Constantinople, 13
- Neyelov — architect, 195, 197
- Nikiforov — outpost commander, 126
- Nikolayev — lieutenant, 250
- Nikolaichik, F. — author, 192, 266
- Nikolayev — merchant, 260
- Nikon — patriarch of Moscow, 144
- Nizhynets', Ivan — Greek mayor of St. Elizabeth, 161, 162
- Nohay — Zaporozhian officer, 312
- Norov — cossack colonel, 324
- Nosenko, Grigori — cossack, 152
- Novitski, Ya. — author, 190, 248, 298-300, 309
- Nykorytsya — captain, 229, 230
- Obreskov, A. M. — Russian minister resident in Constantinople, 66, 103, 107, 261
- Odobash, N. S. (also Adabash) — court counselor, colonel, 93, 100, 101, 102, 103, 143, 150, 151, 196, 198, 230, 232, 240, 288, 303
- Olishchyn, Joseph Petrovich — captain, first major, 99, 100, 101, 109, 151, 173, 194, 196
- Olynykiv — gunner, 123
- Olyferenko — gunner, 149
- Orlov, G. G. Prince — Head of Chancery for Foreign Colonists, 202
- Osterman, I. A. — count, Russian diplomat, president of College of Foreign Affairs, 311
- Padalka, L. — author, 6
- Palkin — merchant, 265
- Panin — lieutenant colonel, 190
- Panin, Nikita I. — count, senator, Russian chancellor, 167, 182, 297, 300, 301, 303, 308, 311, 327
- Panin, Peter I. — count, senator, general en chef, Russian army commander, 170, 182, 281, 290, 299
- Pantazyi — captain, 229, 230
- Parshev — merchant, 265
- Pashutin, Stepan — merchant, 232, 260
- Patenko, S. — author, 62
- Patrin — quartermaster, 240
- Paul — deacon, 61
- Pavlov — merchant, 265
- Perich, Dmitri — lieutenant colonel in Nova Serbiya, 85, 89, 90, 93, 98
- Perych — noble family, 41
- Peter I — emperor of Russia, 1682-1725, 6, 7, 40, 48, 68, 144, 262
- Peter II — emperor of Russia, 1727-1730, 8
- Peter III — emperor of Russia, 1761-1762, 93
- Petrovich, Vasili — "bishop," adventurer, 106, 171, 172
- Philaret (Filaret) — monk, 144
- Picheta, V. — author, 326
- Pimenov — lieutenant, member of Catherine district chancery, 197
- Piščević (Pischnovich), A. S. — author, son of S. S. Piščević, 48, 53, 57, 69, 100, 109, 174, 318, 323, 324
- Piščević, S. S. — major, author of memoirs, 40, 48, 76, 82, 92, 94, 99, 118-120, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174, 196
- Plovetski — first major, colonel, 194, 196, 229, 230
- Poletyka, H. A. — writer, 303, 305-307
- Popov — auditor, 88
- Popov, Dmitri — captain, 145, 146
- Popov, Nil — author, 42, 43, 47, 48, 61, 71, 73, 76, 82, 89, 90, 92, 94, 96, 99, 107, 109, 110, 118, 120, 169-171, 174, 196
- Popovich — captain, colonel, 99, 323
- Popovych, Manuylo — merchant, 252, 266
- Porokhnya — Zaporozhian officer, 293, 294
- Potapenko — Zaporozhian cossack, 315

- Potemkin, Grigori Aleksandrovich — prince, commander in chief of New Russia, Russian statesman, 193, 213, 245, 277, 282, 311, 314, 320, 328
- Potocki — noble Polish family, 52
- Potocki, Anton Protasius — count, Polish voivode of Kiev province, 53, 54
- Preradović — Serbian colonel (see Rajko-de-Preradovich)
- Presnyakov, A. — author, 326
- Prodam — a *familiyat* of Moldavian rgt., 322
- Prokopovich — auditor, 222
- Pushkarev — merchant, 265
- Putimtsev — lieutenant, 190
- Pysarev's'kyi — recruiting agent, 146
- Radkevich — captain, 99
- Raich-Dmytrashko — noble family, 41
- Rajko-de-Preradović — colonel, Serbian colony leader, 47, 49, 71-73, 78, 92, 102, 103, 107, 109, 119, 121, 170, 174, 175, 183, 188
- Ratmet — lieutenant, 250
- Reikhel — physician, 197
- Reva — inhabitant of Tyshkivka, 153
- Rigelman, N. — author, 323
- Robota — lieutenant, 130, 132, 141, 146
- Robota, Vasy! — ensign, lieutenant, 135
- Roshkovych — second major, colonel, 295
- Roste — lieutenant, 250
- Rozhdestvenski, V. — author, 220
- Rozumov's'kyi, Kyril G. — count, *Met-*man of Ukraine, 1750-1764, 18, 33, 66, 114, 117, 124-127, 144, 172, 173, 185, 308, 325
- Rozumov's'kyi, Otekса — count, brother of preceding, 33
- Rud., Mykola — Zaporozhian colonel, 312, 313
- Rudenko — staff comrade, 314
- Rudnev — landowner, 327
- Rumyantsev, P. A. — count, field marshal, 181, 242, 252, 288, 289, 302, 303, 307
- Runich — lieutenant, landowner, 224
- Runov's'kyi — quartermaster, 185, 234
- Rusov, O. O. — author, 24, 28, 178
- Ryshkovych — second major, 229, 230
- Sahaydachnyi, Leontyi — cossack, settlement agent and otaman of Tsybuliv, 27
- Savel'yev — captain, 120, 121
- Savrans'kyi — haydamak, 174
- Sedel'nikov, Ivan — serf, 159
- Sedyakin — major, 75, 186
- Selin — merchant, 260
- Semeniv, V. — regimental clerk, 133, 134
- Semenov, F. — interpreter, 88
- Semevski, V. — author, 233
- Senkov's'kyi, Fedir — merchant, 260, 262
- Senkov's'kyi, Semen — merchant, 262
- Serbynov — salter, 120
- Serezliyi, Lazar — major, lt. colonel, 58, 96, 170, 198, 229, 230, 260
- Shabel'ski, Ivan — lt. colonel, colonel, and voivode of Bakhmut, 197, 198, 217, 248
- Shapochnyk — inhabitant of *sloboda*, 113
- Sharov — physician, 195
- Shchekalov, A. — author, 115
- Shcherbatov — prince (not otherwise identified), 232
- Shcherbina, V. — author, 36, 78
- Shcherbinin — general, 189, 190, 245, 298, 321, 327
- Shetnov — major general, 84
- Šević, Ivan — colonel of Serbians, 47-49, 71-73, 78, 92, 102, 103, 107, 109, 170, 174, 183, 188, 235
- Shimanov, A. — author, 245, 294, 310, 318, 327
- Shkola — Zaporozhian adjutant, 322
- Shmidt — quartermaster, 254
- Shmidt, A. — author, 36, 51, 59, 66, 67, 70, 96, 129, 168, 188



- Shmit — lieutenant, 240  
 Shmit — major in Nova Serbiya, president of Commission of Accounts, 87, 92, 93  
 Shmul' — inhabitant of Smila, 263  
 Shterich (Šterić) — second major, 235-237, 249, 252  
 Shurygin — settler, 239  
 Shuvalov, P. I. — count, 127, 128  
 Shvets' — cossack, 153  
 Sinel'nikov — first major, 235  
 Sirenko Ivan — captain, 131, 136, 139, 140, 153, 232  
 Sirenko, Matthew — captain, 136, 139, 140, 152  
 Skal'kovski, A. A. — author, 5, 6, 11-13, 17, 30, 35, 40-47, 56, 57, 64-66, 72, 74-75, 86, 94, 105-108, 127, 129, 145, 146, 163, 167, 175, 182, 187-193, 198, 235, 239, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 282, 291, 293-302, 311, 312, 315, 317, 318, 328  
 Skarzhyn'ski — commander of Moldavian-Valach unit, 253  
 Skoropads'kyi, Ivan — Hetman of Ukraine, 1798-1722, 8, 325  
 Slabchenko, M. — author, 115, 250, 319  
 Smola — Zaporozhian officer, 315  
 Solomenikov, Aleksandr — merchant, 263  
 Solov'yev, S. — historian, 7, 12, 42, 43, 47, 54, 66, 91, 93, 104, 107, 202, 305, 306  
 Sonnenfels (Freiherr Joseph von Sonnenfels) — economist, 200  
 Spichinski — colonel, 93, 110, 113, 114, 168  
 Stabyn'skyi, Stephen — architect, 61  
 Stanishev — ensign, 254  
 Stanislavski, Luka — colonel, 95  
 Stanislavski, S. — author, 264  
 Stankevich — lieutenant, 109  
 Starenko, Hryts'ko — settlement agent, 239  
 Starikov — settler, 239  
 Stavroyeni — ensign, 240  
 Stefanov — lieutenant, 250  
 Stina — cossack, 315  
 Stoffeln, von (Shtofel'n) — general, 23, 185, 234, 235, 304  
 Stojanovych, Stojko — master butcher, 260, 261  
 Stots'kyi — cossack, 153  
 Streshnev, P. N. — general en chef, 83  
 Sudiyenko, M. — author, 303, 305  
 Sukhomlynov — lieutenant (re: his widow), 222  
 Sukhyna — otaman, 241  
 Sukura — Zaporozhian officer, 322  
 Sushilin — merchant, 153, 232, 258, 266  
 Sych, Semen — lieutenant and settlement agent, 136, 146  
 Synehub — captain, 184, 286, 287  
 Taban, Yur'ko — haydamak, 159  
 Taban, — haydamak, 174  
 Tans'kyi — colonel, 27  
 Taran, Stepan — settlement agent and otaman, 27  
 Tavrov'ska, Catherine — burghess of St. Elizabeth, 160  
 Ternovski, N. — author, 170, 188, 197, 216, 248  
 Theodosius (Feodossi) — monk, 144  
 Tibekin — vice governor, 321  
 Titov — merchant, 260  
 Tkachenko, M. — author, 24  
 Tokar, Vasyli' — business partner of Lt. Fedorenko, 162  
 Tolstoi — general, 49, 151  
 Tolstoi, G. P. — state councilor, 87, 88  
 Tott, baron de — French resident in the Crimea, 278, 279  
 Tovstyk — Secretary of the Zaporozhian Host, 74  
 Trebyn'skyi — noble family, 41  
 Trebyn'skyi — sergeant and ensign, 173  
 Trunov — first major, commander of Kazan' Tatars, 166

- Trofimov — merchant, 260  
 Tsebra — inhabitant of Troynyt's'ke, 141  
 Tsvetinovich — first major, colonel, 96, 98, 99, 119, 229  
 Tuhan-Baranovs'kyi, M. I., 326  
 Turgenyev, Endi — sergeant in Slavyanoserbiya, 121  
 Tyahun — cossack, 315  
 Tymchenko — lancer deputy to Commission of 1767, 289  
 Tymofiyiv (Timofeyev) — judge, 248  
 Tymets', Fedir — merchant, 263  
 Ul'yanin — captain, 33  
 Ustymovych — lieutenant, 130, 132, 141, 146, 232  
 Usychenko, Philip — cossack, 137  
 Uvalov — second major, colonel, 229, 232, 324  
 Vaida, Daniel — secretary, 95  
 Vakiy — settlement agent, 72  
 Vasich, Gennadius — ~~merchant~~ of Slavovych, 109  
 Vasyliv — merchant, 259  
 Vasyliv — priest, 260  
 Velitsyn, A. — author, 115  
 Velykyi, Luk'yan — cossack, 315  
 Veshnakov — collegiate registrar, 88  
 Vikovych — settler, 232  
 Villebois, Alexander (Vil'bua) — general, chief of ordnance corps, member of Council of State, 182, 230  
 Virmenko, Demyan — company clerk (also Mayakovs'kyi), 290, 322  
 Vishnyakov — lieutenant, secretary of Yelizavetgrad district chancery, 197  
 Volkodav — settlement agent, 235  
 Volkov, P. — physician, 88  
 Voroniv — cossack, 153  
 Vovk, Kyrylo — captain, 150  
 Voyeikov, Fedor Matveyevich — general en chef, 186, 193-197, 212-215, 221, 223, 233, 237, 241, 252, 258, 260, 280, 288, 295, 296, 307, 311  
 Voyna, Fedir — captain, 135  
 Voytenko — inhabitant of Tsybuliv, 26  
 Vulich — ensign, 48  
 Vyazemski, A. A. — prince, Procurator General of Senate, 181, 301, 303, 311  
 Vytkovych — family name, 41  
 Weissbach (Veisbakh) — governor general, 10, 12, 13, 18, 25, 34, 40, 43  
 Yakovlev — councillor, finance officer, 88  
 Yakovliv — Zaporozhian officer, 315  
 Yalovyi — Zaporozhian officer, 315  
 Yarilov — merchant, 265  
 Yastrebov, V. N. — author, 54, 70, 101, 107, 136, 141, 146, 150, 151, 161, 173-177, 252, 323  
 Yefimenko, P. — author, 314  
 Yegorov — inhabitant of Yelizavetgrad, 241  
 Yermin — colonel, 126  
 Yeropkin — landowner, 294  
 Yermak — merchant, 266  
 Yulinets' — captain, member of Catherine district chancery, 197  
 Yur'yev — settler, 232  
 Yust, F. I. — major general, 67, 83, 86, 88, 91, 166  
 Yuzbash — first major, 98  
 Zabelin — Russian scholar, 200  
 Zakharov, Aleksei — merchant, 265  
 Zakharov, Mikhail — merchant, 265  
 Zaliznyak, M. cossack, leader of *Koliushchyna*, 319  
 Zamfirakovich, Monolakii — Moldavian nobleman, 103, 104  
 Zarul's'kyi, Stanislav — author, 310  
 Zaykovs'kyi — staff comrade, 234  
 Zervanyts'kyi — captain, 135, 147, 322  
 Ziegler (Tsigler) — name, 235  
 Zorych (Zorich) — brigadier, 84, 194  
 Zub — captain, 38  
 Zvenyhorods'kyi — otaman, 138  
 Zvenyhorods'kyi, David — cossack, settlement agent, 27, 32  
 Zvenyhorods'kyi, Gregory — captain, mayor of St. Elizabeth, 142, 161, 163

## LIST OF GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES

- Adzhamka — river and settlement, 65,  
74, 149, 150, 252, 279, 280
- Aladiivka — settl., 246
- Aleksandriya, see Oleksandriya
- Aleksandrovsk — city, 248, 298
- Aleksandrovs'ka, see Oleksandrovs'ka  
Fortress
- Aleshki, see Oleshki
- America, 262
- Andrusivka or Chonhrad — village, 23,  
28, 29, 56, 57, 187
- Antonivka — settl., 242
- Arkhangel's'k, see Novoarkhangel's'k  
"Artillery" Settlement, see Pulkivs'ka
- Asia, 2
- Austria, 11, 41, 42, 46, 47, 115, 118, 160,  
178, 250, 251
- Avul — settl., 33
- Aydar River, 247
- Azov (Oziv) — town and province, 2,  
7, 187, 190, 262, 263, 310, 328
- Azov Sea, 16, 17, 18, 189, 299
- Bacha, see Becha
- Bakhmut River, town and province,  
16, 47, 49, 70, 71, 73, 119-121, 186-188,  
192, 196, 197, 214, 217, 233-237, 243,  
245, 247, 248, 252, 254, 255, 257, 267,  
270, 274-276, 281, 283, 284, 301, 303,  
304, 318
- Balta — town, 263
- Banat, 107
- Barvinkova Stinka — settl., 189, 294,  
318
- Baturyn — town, 42, 314
- Baydak — settl. 126
- Bazavluk River, 12, 15, 21
- Becha or Bacha (later Oleksandriya)  
— settl., 57, 187
- Bechka — settl., 254
- Bekeneya River, 16
- Belevs'ka — settl., 189
- Belgrade, 16, 26
- Bendery, 104, 136, 261
- Berda River, 16-18, 189, 298
- Berdychiv — city, 263
- Berdynka River, 16
- Berehova River, 235
- Bereka — settl., 246, 247
- Berestova -- settl., 246
- Berets'ki Vershyny -- settl., 246
- Beresivka River and settl., 28, 50
- Beresnihovata River, 319
- Bershats, see Nestcrivka
- Beshka River and settl., 64, 65, 74, 149
- Bessarabiya, 105, 242
- Bila River and settl., 71, 236
- Bila Tserkva (Belaya Tserkov) — vil.  
13
- Bilevs'ka Fortress, 34
- Bilhorod or Belgorod (formerly Akker-  
man) — city, 34, 261, 298
- Bilyky — settl., 185
- Black Sea, 2, 309, 311
- Blahovat -- settl., 57
- Blyznyuky — mound, 75
- Boh River, see Bug
- Bohorodyts'kyi Retrenchment, 10
- Bokova River, 31
- Bolkhov -- town, 160, 265
- Borodaivka — vil., 21, 65, 148, 187, 230,  
296
- Borovsk — town, 160
- Borisohlibs'ka Fortress, 34
- Boyans'ka — settl., 65, 127, 148, 187
- Bozhedarivka — settl., 295
- Brandenburg, 250
- Bratslav Voivodship (Voyevodstvo), 59,  
144
- Brody — town, 263
- Bryansk -- city, 140, 241, 265
- Bug or Boh Liman, 311
- Bug or Boh, Southern, River, 6-8, 10,  
14, 16, 21, 30, 36, 52, 57, 128 188,  
253, 293, 297, 329

- Khoroshyi Yar — retrenchment, 72  
 Khortytsya Island, 51  
 Kiev — city and province, 10, 27, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38-40, 44, 47, 48, 51, 54, 60, 77-80, 84-87, 92, 108, 109, 113, 117, 126, 144, 146, 172, 188, 241, 251, 267, 281, 292, 308, 314, 326  
 Kilchen River, 39, 281  
 Kinburn — town, 310, 317  
 Kins'ka River and vil., 248, 298  
 Kins'ki Vody (Konskiye Vody) River, 16, 47, 189  
 Klyntsi — vil., 65, 145, 242  
 Klysh — settl., 34  
 Knyazha Balka → settl., 323  
 Klyntsi — vil., 65, 145, 242 304  
 Kodyma River, 14, 16  
 Kolontaivka — vil., 23, 28, 242  
 Komysarivka — settl., 323  
 Komyshuvata Suhakleya, see Suhakleya River  
 Konkra River, 16, 17  
 Konskiye Vody, see Kins'ki Vody  
 Konotop — vil., 28  
 Korobchyno or Pichka — settl., 57, 158, 187  
 Korsun' — settl., 317  
 Kostovata River, 31  
 Kovalivka — settl., 23, 28  
 Kovyn — settl., 57  
 Kozlovs'ka Fortress, 34, 189  
 Kozyrshchyna — vil., 35, 295  
 Krasna — settl., 58, 65, 149, 153  
 Krasnokamyanka — settl., 322  
 Krasnosillya — settl., 188  
 Krasnyi Yar or Krasnoyars'ka — settl., 71, 242  
 Kremenchuk or Kremenchug Fortress, 19, 114, 143, 185, 189, 191, 192, 194, 243, 266, 287, 304  
 Kriukiv, see Kryukiv  
 Kruhlyi Bayrak (Round Ravine), 23  
 Kruta Balka — settl., 72  
 Kruzhylyna — settl., 73  
 Kryliv or Krylov (later Novo-Georgiyevsk) — town, 7, 16, 22, 23, 28-30, 32, 36, 39, 53, 57, 62, 114, 127, 187  
 Kryms'ka Yama — vil., 72  
 Kryms'kyi Entrenchment, 71, 72  
 Krynka River, 189  
 Kruhiv — settl., 28  
 Kryukiv or Kriukiv — vil., 23, 53, 90, 187, 192, 210, 242, 243  
 Kryvyi Torets', see Torets' River  
 Kucheivka — settl., 188  
 Kuchuk-Kainardji — vil., 2, 310  
 Kursk Province, 247  
 Kurylivs'ke — settl., 28  
 Kutsiv or Kutsivka — settl., 311, 318, 323  
 Kuz'myn Yar — settl., 20  
 Kyrylivs'ka Fortress, 189, 190  
 Kyshenka — settl., 185, 189  
 Kytayhorod — settl., 35, 185, 394  
 Laheri — settl., 188  
 Larivka — settl., 246, 247  
 Laskivka — settl., 28  
 Lebedyn Forest, 119  
 Lebyazhyns'ka — settl., 246  
 Lelekivka — settl., 255  
 Linivka — settl., 246  
 Lithuania, 264  
 Livens'ka Fortress, 34  
 Livonia, 181, 202, 264  
 Lokhvyts'a — town, 314  
 Lozova — settl., 70, 295  
 Lozova Pavlivka — settl., 72  
 Lozovata River, 296  
 Lozovatka — settl., 188, 244  
 Lozoven'ka — settl., 246  
 Lozovyi Yar — settl., 20  
 Lubens'ki Polk (Lubny Regiment), 26, 41, 114, 166, 184, 219  
 Luhan' (Lugan) or Luhan'ka River, 49, 70-73, 119, 188, 254, 286, 301

- Luhanchyk River, 247  
 Luhans'ka — settl., 71  
 Luhans'kyi Polk (Luhan' Regiment),  
 189, 217, 267, 271, 274, 289  
 Lukhivka — settl., 146  
 Lunha or Bulgaria Lake, 105  
 Lyanyts'ka or Fedvar — settl., 57, 158,  
 187, 266, 279  
 Lychkova — settl., 184  
 Lykhodiivka — settl., 28  
 Lypniazhka River and settl., 246, 254,  
 255  
 Lypyanka — settl., 188  
 Lysa Hora — settl., 64, 145, 188, 253,  
 293  
 Macedonia, 161, 251  
 Makariv — settl., 323  
 Makarivs'ki Yar — settl., 295  
 Malaya Rossiya or Malorossiia (Little  
 Russia), 6, 8, 11, 25, 27, 33, 41, 45,  
 74, 114, 125, 126, 130, 138, 143, 144,  
 161, 181, 186, 190, 218, 223, 280,  
 281, 287, 288, 293, 298, 307, 309,  
 318, 324, 328  
 Mandorlak — settl., 57  
 Manzheliivka — settl., 173  
 Marosh River, 41  
 Martonosh, see Yeremina Balka  
 Mashoryn, see Ivankivtsi  
 Mayachka River and settl., 35, 38, 185,  
 189, 246, 294  
 Maydanschyna — settl., 33  
 Medvezha Balka — settl., 235  
 Mertvi Vody River, 16, 31  
 Mezhyhirs'kyi Monastery, 314  
 Milova — settl., 246  
 Minsk — city, 17  
 Mishchans'ka — settl., 159  
 Mius River, 17, 71, 247  
 Mohyl'chani Bayraky River, 189  
 Mohylyv or Sentiv — vil., 35, 57, 158,  
 187  
 Moldavia, 103, 104, 107, 144, 145, 160,  
 242, 251, 252  
 Monasteryshche — settl., 20  
 Montenegro, 106, 107  
 Morozivka — settl., 73  
 Moscow, 152, 265  
 Motronyn Forest, 23  
 Mtsensk — town, 265  
 Murzychka — settl., 135, 136  
 Murzynka — settl., 65, 149, 151, 153, 187,  
 280, 290  
 Murzyno — settl., 254  
 Myheys'kyi Tashlyk, see Tashlyk River  
 Mykhaylivka or Yelizavetgradivka —  
 settl., 188, 246  
 Mykhaylivs'ka Fortress, 34  
 Sv. Mykola (St. Nicholas) Fortress,  
 53, 56  
 Mykolaivka — settl., 281  
 Myktyyns'kyi Ford, 304  
 Myrhorod, see Novomyrhorod  
 Myrhorod (Mirgorod) Regiment, 22-25,  
 27, 28, 30-33, 37, 50, 51, 114, 122,  
 123, 126, 135, 143, 166, 183, 184, 186,  
 191, 287  
 Myshuryn Rih — settl., 24, 29, 65, 85,  
 148, 187, 210, 280  
 Nadlak or Nadlatsk — stttl., 57, 158,  
 187  
 Nekhvoroshcha — settl., 185, 189  
 Nenasytets' Retrenchment, 29  
 Nerubay Forest, 60, 61  
 Nesterivka (later Bershats or Vershach)  
 — settl., 23, 28, 56, 57, 158, 187  
 New Russia, see Novorossiia  
 New Serbiya, see Nova Serbiya  
 New Sich, see Nova Sich  
 St. Nicholas Fortress, see Sv. Mykhola  
 Fortress  
 Nikitin Redoubt, see Nyktyyn Redoubt  
 Nikol's'ka, see Nykol's'ka settl.  
 Nizhyn — town, 161, 251  
 Nogai Steppe, 6  
 Nova Byyukina — settl., 246  
 Nova Serbiya (New Serbia), 1, 5, 32,  
 40, 45-47, 49-56, 58, 59, 61, 63-66,

- 69, 73-79, 81-89, 91-98, 101-108, 110, 112-117, 119-124, 127-129, 132, 135, 136, 142-144, 146, 150-152, 154-157, 159-168, 170-178, 181-183, 187, 189, 193, 203, 204, 206, 208, 211, 232, 253, 261, 272, 291, 294, 301, 302, 305, 307, 309, 310, 313, 318
- Nova Sich (New Sich) , 1, 5, 11, 15, 35, 77, 105, 296, 298, 301, 302, 311, 317
- Novi Aydary — settl., 119
- Novoarkhangel's'k or Arkhangel's'k, 27, 29, 30, 36, 37, 39, 55-58, 65, 66, 77, 105, 108, 128, 137, 158, 164, 187, 192, 210, 266
- Novofahataivka — settl., 188
- Novogeorgiyevsk, see Kryliv
- Novohryhorivka — settl., 298
- Novomyrhorod or Myrhorod (Novo-Mirgorod), formerly Trysyahy, 53, 56-63, 77, 87, 95, 97, 105, 107, 112, 118, 135, 156, 158, 159, 168, 187, 192, 210, 260, 266
- Novoobids'ka — settl., 246, 247
- Novorossiya (New Russia), 1-3, 48, 53, 69, 75, 105, 137, 145, 170, 176, 177, 181-194, 196, 198, 200, 202-205, 209-225, 230, 232-238, 241-245, 248-257, 262-267, 272, 275-290, 293, 294, 297, 303, 304, 306-309, 311, 314, 317-325, 328, 329
- Novoselivka — settl., 236
- Novosillya — settl., 304
- Nykol's'ka (Nikol's'ka) — settl., 145, 239, 242
- Nykytyn (Nikitin) Redoubt, 36
- Nykytyns'ka Fortress, 189, 190
- Nyzhnya — settl., 71, 72
- Oboyansk — settl., 24
- Ochakiv (Ochakov) — town, 10, 14, 67
- Odessa, 115, 212, 262, 297
- Odobashivka — settl., 324
- Odojev — town, 265
- Oleksandrivska (Aleksandrivs'ka) Fort-  
tress, 189, 190
- Oleksandriya or Aleksandriya (form.  
Becha) — town and district, 20, 28,  
57
- Oleksiiivka — settl., 246, 247
- Oleksiyivs'ka Fortress, 34, 189, 190
- Oleshki (Alcshki) — settl., 7-9, 15, 21,  
22, 24, 34
- Ol'khovatkva or Panchiv (Panchov) —  
settl., 56, 57, 158, 187
- Ol'shanka, see Tyshkivka
- Omel'nychok — settl., 28
- Omel'nyk River and settl., 21, 22, 50,  
65, 135, 151, 187
- Omel'nyts'ka — settl., 137, 148
- Orchakivs'ka — settl., 246
- Orel' (Orel) River, settl. and district,  
6, 7, 14-17, 30, 32, 35-37, 47, 65, 75,  
146, 149, 185, 187, 210, 246, 289, 291,  
293-296, 299, 302, 306
- Orenburg — city and province, 47, 85,  
107, 166
- Orlivshchyna — settl., 20
- Orlivs'ka Fortess, 34
- Orlyanka — settl., 187, 280
- Orlyk — settl., 35, 38
- Orlyts'ka — settl., 189
- Orobiivka — settl., 23
- Orobsivka or Vorobtsivka — vil., 28,  
32
- Ovnyanka — settl., 137, 148, 149, 324
- Paliyevе Ozero — settl., 263
- Panchiv, see Ol'khovatkva
- Sv. Paraskevyy or Sv.-Paraskovika (St.  
Parasceve) Fortress, 34, 189, 236
- Pavlovs'ka Fortress and settl., 118, 236,  
253
- Pavlysh — settl., 57, 187
- Perekop, 10
- Pereshchepina — vill., 35
- Perevolochna Fortress, 16, 21, 32-34, 36,  
68, 85, 185, 189
- Pereyaslav — town, 97, 166, 184
- Permian Camp — suburb of St. Eliza-  
beth, 70

- St. Petersburg, 43, 44, 48, 71, 79, 83,  
91, 94, 127, 131, 141, 146, 202, 251,  
291, 301, 302, 307, 310, 318, 328
- Sv. Petra (St. Peter) Fortress, 34
- Petrovs'ka Fortress, 189, 220, 255
- Petrivka — settl., 318, 323
- Petroostriv, see Davydivka
- Petrova or Petrivs'ka — settl., 246, 324
- Petrykivka — settl., 187
- Pichka, see Korobchyno
- Pidhirna — settl., 281
- Pidhorodne — vil., 71, 72
- Pidpil'na River, 1, 12, 26
- Pidsivka — settl., 28
- Pikinerna — settl., 220
- Pilazhnitsa — settl., 57
- Pishchanka — settl., 188, 246
- Pishchanyi Brid — settl., 64, 145, 253,  
293
- Plakhtiivka or Zimun' (Zymun') —  
settl., 24, 56, 57, 127, 187
- Pletenyi Tashlyk, see Tashlyk River
- Plos'ka — settl., 24, 242
- Podil — district of St. Elizabeth For-  
tress, 70, 191
- Podolia — province, 144
- Pokhodiivka — settl., 23, 28
- Pokrovs'ka — settl., 242, 325
- Poland, 6, 11, 17, 22, 26, 27, 31, 39,  
51, 55, 64, 78, 80, 103, 104, 124-129,  
136, 143-146, 152, 153, 155, 157, 159-  
161, 178, 209, 210, 236, 239-242, 261,  
263, 277, 302, 304, 309, 312, 313, 318,  
320
- Polovtysi — settl., 280
- Poltava — city and region, 7, 20, 21,  
23-25, 29, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 114,  
122, 135, 143, 166, 183, 184, 186, 233,  
234, 244, 255
- Pomerania, 250
- Popel'nyasta — settl., 187, 280
- Popovyi Yar, 247
- Porte, see Turkey
- Potik — settl., 22, 143
- Praskoviys'ka — settl., 189
- Protopopivka — settl., 246, 248
- Protovcha River, 21
- Prussia, 250
- Pruth River, 7, 12, 13, 16
- Pryvol'ne — vil., 71, 73
- Pulkivs'ka or "Artillery" Settlement, 70
- Pushkarivka — vil., 35, 65, 148, 153
- Putivl' — town, 160, 265
- Pyatyhirs'ka — settl., 189
- Pysarivka — settl., 184
- Rayhorodok — settl., 38
- Revuche Lake, 150
- Rivnyanka — settl., 65
- Rogervik, 284
- Romaniv Yav — settl., 20
- Romanova Mohyla — settl., 127
- Romny — town, 160, 314
- Rosokhivka — vil., 28
- Rossiya, see Russia
- Rostov District, 159
- Ruchky — town, 28
- Ruda — settl., 188
- Rudivka — settl., 281
- Rushchuk, 252
- Russia (Rossiya), Russian Empire, 2,  
6, 7, 11, 12, 14-18, 23, 26, 41-47, 51,  
56, 70, 102, 106, 107, 114, 115, 122,  
125, 136, 144, 160, 161, 163, 172, 174,  
178, 187, 201-203, 205, 207, 210, 212,  
233, 236, 233, 240, 241, 246-248, 251,  
252, 262, 264, 281, 304, 310-312, 315,  
319, 325, 326, 329
- Ryaz'ka Fortress, 34, 189
- Ryaz'ka Vasyliivs'ka — settl., 246
- Ryl's'k — town, 265
- Saksahan' River, 21, 31, 75
- Samara Entrenchment, 299
- Samara Monastery, 281
- Samara River, 7-10, 18, 21, 29, 31, 35,  
39, 49, 72, 75, 188, 189, 244, 293,  
301-306
- Samara or Stara Samara — Zaporozhian  
town, 6, 14, 20, 25, 31-33, 38, 39, 68,

- 305, 318  
 Sambir (Sambor) or Tsykivka — settl.,  
 57, 158, 187  
 Samotkan' River, 64, 291, 293  
 Santomash — settl., 57  
 Sanzhary Stari i Novi — settl., 185, 189  
 Saratov, 202, 251  
 Sava River, 41  
 Savran' — settl., 159  
 Semlek (Semlyak) or Skeleva — settl.,  
 57, 158, 187, 252, 261  
 Senzherivka River, 71  
 Sentiv, see Mohyliv  
 Serebryanka — settl., 71  
 Serbiya, 107  
 Serbyna — settl., 188  
 Sevsk District, 34, 247, 248  
 Shabelinka — settl., 246, 247  
 Shalmosh or Sholmosh, see Stetsivka  
 Shapovalivka — vil., 28  
 Sherkov Protoka, 247  
 Shterychanka — settl., 236  
 Shyshaky — vil., 143  
 Siberia, 290  
 Silesia, 118, 152, 261  
 Silistriya, 252  
 Sirmia, 42  
 Sivers'kyi Donets', see Donets' River  
 Skeleva, see Semlek  
 Slankamin' — settl., 57  
 Slavonia, 105  
 Slavyanoserbiya (Slavic Serbia), 1, 5,  
 40, 49, 50, 70-77, 92, 102, 105, 107,  
 108, 110, 115, 119-122, 163, 164, 167,  
 169, 170, 173, 175, 176, 178, 181-183,  
 187, 193, 216, 217, 233  
 Slavyanoserbsk, see Donets'k  
 Slobids'ka Fortress, 34  
 Slobids'ka Ukraine, 2, 33, 34, 121, 156,  
 157, 218-220, 243, 245, 247, 283, 292,  
 294, 298, 307, 318, 321, 327  
 Slobidskyi Regiment and Province, 64,  
 71, 73-76, 82, 85, 91, 96, 104, 116, 125,  
 128, 129, 132, 134, 136-139, 143-154,  
 157, 160, 163, 166-169, 175, 176, 181,  
 183, 187, 190, 196, 214, 232, 234, 279,  
 281, 286  
 Smila — town, 55, 60, 61, 118, 156, 261,  
 263, 289  
 Sokilka — settl., 185, 189, 289  
 Sokol's'k — redoubt, 33, 36  
 Solona River, 16, 254  
 Sorochyntsi — vil., 143  
 Southern Bug (Boh), see Bug  
 Spain, 262  
 Spars'ke — settl., 323  
 Spas'ke — settl., 20  
 Srem, 107  
 Starodub'ye, 26, 145  
 Starookhotna, or Starookhocha — settl.,  
 246  
 Starovirs'ka — settl., 246  
 Stetsivka or Shalmosh — vil., 23, 28,  
 56, 57, 187  
 Subotish — settl., 57  
 Subotytsya (Subotitsa) — settl., 158,  
 187, 279  
 Suhakleya River, 31  
 Suhakleya Kamyaniysta River, 65  
 Suhakleya Komyshuvata River, 74  
 Sukhodil — vil., 72  
 Sukhyl Tashlyk, see Tashlyk River  
 Sukhyi Torets', see Torets' River  
 Sura River, 21  
 Svyarnya — town, 28  
 Synyukha (Sinyukha) River and settl.,  
 6, 7, 16, 17, 59, 164, 252, 253, 296  
 Synyushyn Brid — settl., 105, 188, 254  
 Taboryshche (Taburyshche) — settl.,  
 28, 57, 58, 127  
 Taburny — settl., 187  
 Taganrog, 120, 187, 255, 263, 298  
 Tambovs'ka Fortress, 34  
 Targowica or Torhovyttsya, 27, 52  
 Tashlyk River and settl., 16, 58, 135  
 Tashlyk Chorny River, 74, 293, 304  
 Tashlyk Myheys'kyi River, 323  
 Tashlyk Pletenyi River and settl., 65,



- 136, 146, 149, 187, 188, 253  
Tashlyk Sukhyi River and settl., 105,  
164, 188, 296  
Terekhtemyriv — vil., 5, 6  
Ternivka River and settl., 53, 65, 144,  
149, 188, 253  
Tetiiv — vil., 263  
Tisa River, 41  
Tokmak River, 16  
Tonkonohivka — vil., 28, 242  
Tor — settl., 294, 317, 318  
Torets' River, 247, 306  
Torets' Kazennyi River, 189  
Torets' Kryvyi River, 189, 254  
Torets' Sukhyi River, 189  
Transylvania, 107  
Trest'tsetnevo, see Trytuzne  
Troits'ka — settl., 71  
Troynnyts'ka — settl., 20, 65, 101, 141,  
148, 151, 280  
Try Bayraky, or Kanizh (Kanyzh) —  
settl., 56, 57, 58, 158, 187  
Trysyahy, see Novomyrhorod  
Trytuzne or Trest'tsetnevo — settl., 33  
Tsargorod, see Constantinople  
Tsarychanka — settl., 34, 35, 38, 185,  
189, 289, 294, 304  
Tsigler — settl., 220  
Tsybuliv — vil., 23, 26, 28, 29, 33, 56,  
57, 77, 123, 126, 127, 158, 164, 187,  
266, 279  
Tsybul'nyk River, 19  
Tsykivka, see Sambir  
Tula — city, 177  
Tura, see Hruz'ka River  
Turkey (Porte), 7, 8, 11, 12-17, 25, 41,  
66, 67, 78, 103, 104, 152, 153, 161, 189,  
210, 261-263, 278, 281, 297, 310, 312  
Tyasmyn (Tyasmin) River, 6, 7, 14, 19,  
22-24, 28, 32, 39, 104  
Tyshkivka or Ol'shanka — settl., 58, 65,  
135, 136, 140-142, 146, 147, 149, 153,  
188, 254  
Ukhivka — vil., 28, 188  
Ukraine, 2, 10, 11, 19, 34, 36, 38, 40,  
41, 47, 49, 83, 129, 130, 144, 171, 172,  
181, 233, 237, 241, 279, 289, 319, 325,  
330, 331  
Ukraine, Left-Bank (Livoberezhna), 2,  
19, 22, 24, 26, 31, 66, 70, 106, 121,  
143, 144, 157, 160, 161, 218, 219, 236,  
243, 244, 251, 263, 278, 283, 288, 325,  
327  
Ukraine, Right-Bank (Pravoberezhna),  
1, 19, 24, 26, 39, 121, 122, 144, 157,  
160, 224, 236, 241, 242, 244, 262, 263,  
288, 289  
Ukraine, Southern (Pivdenna), 1-3, 5,  
19, 26, 36, 38, 88, 106, 122, 163, 176,  
183, 244, 257, 264, 288  
Ukraine Stepova, 288  
"Ukrainian Line" (Ukraińs'ka Liniya),  
10, 19, 34, 35, 47, 49, 127, 183, 185,  
187, 189, 245, 278, 294, 295, 298, 301,  
304  
Uman' — town, 53, 263  
Ust' Samara Redoubt, 35  
Utkyna — settl., 248  
Vadal, 252  
Valuyka Steppe, 281  
Varazhdan (Varazhdyn) — settl., 57,  
187  
Varvaryna Balka — settl., 20  
Vasyl'kivs'ka Fortress, 34  
Velahory — settl., 173  
Velykyi Luh, 298  
Velyts'ka — settl., 189  
Venice, 161  
Venetian Republic, 105  
Verblyuzhka River and settl., 64, 135,  
148, 187, 318, 323, 324  
Verhunka — settl., 71, 72  
Ver'ovkina — settl., 246  
Vershach, see Nesterivka  
Vershynokamyanka — settl., 187  
Veselyi Kut — settl., 239, 342  
Veselen'ka — settl., 72  
Vetka — settl., 26, 145

- Vienna, 42  
 Vilahosh — settl., 100, 101  
 Vilshanka — settl., 252  
 Vinhosh — settl., 57  
 St. Vladimir Fortress, see Sv. Volodymyr Fortress  
 Vlasivka — settl., 22, 143, 173, 185, 189, 287  
 Vodyana — settl., 188  
 Volchiye vody, see Vovcha River  
 Volhynia — province, 20, 144, 326  
 Volkovachivka — vil., 28  
 Vol'ne — settl., 33  
 Sv. Volodymyr Fortress (formerly Petrostriv), 53  
 Vologda — town, 94  
 Voronizh (Voronezh) — town and province, 71, 178, 186, 202, 233, 247, 298  
 Voronivka — settl., 20, 59  
 Voshchynino — vil., 159  
 Vovcha River, Vovchi (Volchiye) Vody, 18, 239  
 Voytove — vil., 28  
 Vschytok — settl., 189  
 Vukovar — settl., 57, 187  
 Vys' River and settl., 7, 28, 51, 57, 58, 62, 65, 96, 136, 144, 149  
 Vys' Nova — settl., 242  
 Vys Velyka — settl., 242  
 Vyska — settl., 187, 188, 253  
 Vysz' — settl., 65  
 Walachia, 104, 107  
 Yampil' — vil., 34  
 Yaniv — settl., 57, 187  
 Yasenovata Zemlyanka — settl., 254  
 Yasenuvate — settl., 20  
 Yefremivka — settl., 246  
 Yefremivs'ka Fortress, 34  
 Yekaternoslavs'ka Eparkhiya (Diocese) and guberniya, 20, 121, 298  
 Yelanets' River, 16, 31  
 Sv. Yelizaveta, see St. Elizabeth Fortress  
 Yelizavetgrad (former Nova Serbiya) — town and province, 58, 65, 70, 137, 187, 191, 196-200, 222-228, 230-235, 240, 241, 243, 245, 249, 252, 253, 256-269, 274-276, 279-282, 285-288, 290, 296, 300-304, 307, 308, 310, 318, 320-324  
 Yelizavetgradivka, see Mykhaylivka  
 Yenikale, 187-310  
 Yeremina Balka or Martonosh — settl., 57, 158, 187  
 Yukhivka — settl., 242  
 Zakhariivs'ka Fortress, 189, 190, 255  
 Zalineyna — settl., 246  
 Zalizna — settl., 20, 254  
 Zaporozhian Hard — settl., 16  
 Zaporozhian Sich or Zaporizhzhya, 1-3, 6-11, 15, 17, 18, 24-27, 32, 34, 36-39, 43, 50, 58, 64, 74, 77, 78, 124-127, 143, 152-154, 160, 161, 170, 179, 181-183, 188, 207, 209, 217, 236, 244, 248-250, 254, 256, 285-302, 307-313, 316, 320, 323-331  
 Zaporozhian Steppe, 1, 6  
 Zelena — settl., 65, 148, 187, 279, 290, 318, 323, 324  
 Zeletskivka — settl., 28  
 Zherebets' River and settl., 247, 248, 298  
 Zhornyshche — settl., 263  
 Zhovtyi Yar — settl., 73  
 Zhytlova Balka — settl., 75  
 Zimyn' (Zymyn'), see Plakhtiivka  
 Zlynka — settl., 65, 145, 242, 253  
 Znamenka — settl., 24  
 Zolotarivka — settl., 239, 242  
 Zvonets'ka Balka — settl., 20  
 Zybka — settl., 242



