

National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

OLEKSANDR D. SUKHOMLYN
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0864-8560>
o.d.sukhomlyn@gmail.com

*Russian Military Presence and Colonisation of Zaporizhian Host
(Orel-Samara Region) in the Age of New Sich (1734–1775)**

Obecność wojsk rosyjskich i zasiedlenie terytorium Zaporozża (regionu między rzekami Orelą i Samarą) w okresie Nowej Siczy (1734–1775)

SUMMARY

This article considers general course of the region's settlement and the process of creating *slobodas* in the vicinity of Russian strongholds, and the colonisation efforts (state and private) undertaken by the Russian administration on the basis of micro-historical approach. Analysis of documents on the census proves that it was the Zaporizhian elites, and not the Russian strongholds, that had a fundamental impact on the process of settlement of Zaporizhia in the 1740s and 1760s. Attempts to control the *slobodas*, situated near the strongholds, by the Russian administration and attempts to extend power to Zaporizhian subjects were not successful.

Keywords: Zaporizhian Host; Southern Ukraine; *sloboda*; colonisation; confessional census; Russian strongholds

INTRODUCTION

The period of New Sich is significant for the history of Southern Ukraine. It is important that an active settlement of areas which belonged to the Zaporizhian

* This article was prepared as part of a research project “Unification and Integration of European Frontier: Comparative Research of Imperial Incorporation Policies in Danubian and Pontic Regions (17th–19th centuries)”, financed by the Scholarship Programme of the Visegrad Fund (Visegrad Scholarship Program, for post-masters).

army took place exactly in the period of New Zaporizhian Sich. Amongst other things, it was due to this colonisation that the majority of still existing civic and village settlements in Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia, partly Kherson, Kirovohrad, Donetsk Oblasts, and other oblasts of modern Ukraine – areas which belonged to Zaporizhia until 1775 – was formed.

Significant breakthrough in the development of the Zaporizhian border community and the entire Southern Ukraine took place in the period of the existence of New Sich. Owing to a number of circumstances in Zaporizhia, a class of owners (proprietors), opposed to the Cossack “proletariat” (*siroma*), was created. While for the *siroma* the most important was the imperative of “spoils” (mainly of war nature) and having a traditional Cossack lifestyle, the settled proprietors thought it was important to consolidate their own prosperity at the expense of development of agriculture and commerce in Zaporizhia. Due to the presence of rich natural resources, intensive influx of people migrated from other regions of Ukraine to the lands of Zaporizhia, economic freedom and, as a consequence, patronage of Sich’s administration, the above-mentioned areas started to develop quickly. Significant role in the colonisation of Southern Ukraine was played by the last Koshovyy Otaman, Petro Kalnyshevs’kyi¹.

In the period of New Sich, Zaporizhia came under the direct control of the Russian Empire, which was exercised from 1734 to the beginning of the 1750s, at first by a Kiev general-governor and then a hetman (until 1764) and the Second Collegium of Little Russia (1764–1775). At the local level, the direct imperial control over Zaporizhia was conducted by the system of fortifications erected in strategically located – from its perspective – places.

The main aspiration of the Russian Empire in the 18th century was to gain access to the Black Sea. This goal was to be achieved by creating and using a massive instrument – a fleet, and to be more precise, the Don and Dnieper flotilla, which had in fact been put into fruition even before the Russo-Turkish War in 1735–1739. For the purpose of supporting the fleet on both banks of the River Dnieper from the estuary of the Orel all the way to the island of Khortytsia, fortified stations were erected from 1735², which in the following years of war became a foundation for building barricades and redoubts. After a rather unexpected end of the war in the autumn of 1739, the majority of strongholds was liquidated by taking the garrisons away and removing the supplies. It took a few more years to move the military equipment to the Ukrainian Line and to liquidate useless

¹ V.V. Grybovsky, *Petro Kalnyshevs’kyi u vymiri polityki ta povsiakdemnosti*, „Kozats’ka spadshchyna: almanah Instytutu suspil’nych doslidzhen” 2006, t. 3.

² Building of outposts on the left bank of the Dnieper, connected with the autumn expedition to Crimea by General Leontiev is dated exactly to 1735 (O.V. Malov, V.O. Veklenko, A.V. Veklenko, *Kartografichni dzherela do istoriyi Bogorodyckoyi fortetsi-Starosamarskogo retranshementu*, „Frontyry mista: istoryko-kulturologichnyy almanah” 2012, t. 1, p. 120.

warships³. As of 1741, the garrisons of all the active Russian strongholds in the territories of Zaporizhia held 1,440 people⁴. The number of garrisons-strongholds along the Lower Dnieper was diminished over time, and as of the 1750s and 1760s there were around 350 military men in Zaporizhia⁵ who created garrisons in 3 strongholds: of New Sich (*Novosichens'kyi retrenchment*)⁶, Old Samara (*Starosamars'kyi retrenchment*)⁷ and Kamyanka (*Kamyans'kyi retrenchment*)⁸, as well as 4 redoubts (Kodatsky⁹, Birkutsky¹⁰, Sokil's'kyi¹¹ and Mykytyns'kyi, the latter is mentioned in the documents as *Mykytynska zastava*¹²).

Due to the fact that the fortifications were initially erected to support and secure the Dnieper flotilla during the time of military activities (which, in accordance with the command's plans, should have been ended with consolidation of the Russian Empire if not in Istanbul¹³ then at least along the Black Sea coast), their functioning in the post-war period was not anticipated in a long term. For this reason, the above-mentioned Russian fortifications became – in their nature – the imperial border observation forts oriented to the Crimean-Tatar direction. In reality, the function of the Russian strongholds as typical warehouses (in the event of a future Russo-Turkish war) was supplemented also with the function of having universal control of the Zaporizhia Host.

The presence of the Russian military in the territory of Zaporizhia was not a substantial military force not only because in the 1750s and 1760s it amounted only to

³ The Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv (hereinafter: CSHAUK), found 59, inventory 1, file 785, fol. 4–5, 84–84v.

⁴ CSHAUK, found 59, inv. 1, file 781, fol. 35v–36.

⁵ CSHAUK, found 755, inv. 1, file 3, fol. 61–62, 63–64, 67–68, 69–70, 71–72, 73–74, 76–77, 80–81.

⁶ The New Sich fortress – a Russian stronghold, was built by Russian Army near the New Sich (Central military camp of Zaporizhian Cossacks) in 1736. At present, it is sunk by a water reservoir.

⁷ Fortifications were preserved on the outskirts of the village of Shevchenko which falls within the border of the modern city of Dnieper.

⁸ They were located in the vicinity of the village of Locmans'ka Kamyanka which falls within the modern city of Dnieper. At present, they are sunk by the waters of the Dnieper Reservoir.

⁹ It was situated on the left bank of the Dnieper River in the city of Dnieper, near Kubans'ka Street.

¹⁰ It was situated not far from the village of Revunivka on the left bank of the Dnieper River in the vicinity of the modern city of Kamyns'ke. At present, the village is sunk by the waters of the Middle Dnieper water reservoir.

¹¹ It was situated in the vicinity of the modern village of Mykolayvka, in Petrykivka District (*rayon*) of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast; at present, there are plots with buildings in the town.

¹² It was situated 5 km from the modern city of Nikopol', Dnipropetrovsk Oblast.

¹³ O.O. Ryabinin-Sklyarevskyy, *Zaporoz'ki zakoloty ta keruyucha verstva Kosha XVIII st.*, [in:] A.A. Ryabinin-Sklyarevskyy. *Materialy k biografii*, red. G.L. Malinova, I.V. Sapozhnikov, Odessa 2000, p. 106.

350 people¹⁴, which constituted a small group in comparison to the Zaporizhia Host. At the beginning of the 1750s, the number of the Zaporizhia Host was equal to 27,000, without including peasant population (we take into consideration only men who were capable of fighting)¹⁵. The Russian strongholds, built in the Zaporizhian region in the times of war in 1735–1739, lost their necessary defensive status very quickly: cannons were laying on the ground without carriages¹⁶, it was possible to cross over on the horseback the land ramparts of the New Sich fortress (embankment and ditch), turnpikes (wooden ramparts) were dismantled for firewood¹⁷. The command often made attempts to bring the fortresses to a proper defensive condition¹⁸, but due to the lack of resources no major repairs were carried out. Secondary importance of the strongholds in Zaporizhia in relation to those situated in the territories of the Cossack Hetmanate are confirmed by the words of an engineer, de Boscet, that the strongholds of Old Samara and New Sich were being repaired by the forces of garrisons which stationed there “as it used to be”¹⁹. The document does not mention any renovations in the redoubts. All of this engendered a situation in which in 1776, the General-Governor of the newly-established Azov Governorate, Vasilii Chertkov, notices that the Birkutskyy redoubt had revealed only 4 small-caliber cannons, some artillery shells, and that the earthen fortifications had long ceased to fulfil their role. The embankment and ditch were so damaged that they could not be seen²⁰. The actual renovation works were carried out only in the stronghold of Old Samara in connection to the next Russo-Turkish War of 1768–1774. However, by that time the Lower Dnieper outposts lost their strategic significance for the Empire; a new line of the Dnieper fortifications was erected along the southern border of Zaporizhia from 1770, which made the Russian stronghold of Zaporizhia (and the entire Zaporizhia) to be moved to the rear.

In this way the Russian fortresses in the territories of Zaporizhia did not perform their defensive functions for the first time in the existence of Zaporizhia, and therefore they could not provide safety to the region. They served a function comparable to the role of the Russian military warehouses in the territories of the Commonwealth, left behind by the Russian army²¹. At the same

¹⁴ CSHAUK, found 755, inv. 1, file 3, fol. 61–62v, 63–64v, 67–68v, 69–70v, 71–72v, 73–74v, 76–77v, 80–81v; file 7, fol. 66–67 v, 68–69v, 70–71v, 72–73v, 78–79v.

¹⁵ *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, t. 14, Warszawa 1880–1914, p. 412.

¹⁶ CSHAUK, found 1639, inv. 1, file 4, fol. 68v.

¹⁷ *Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi. Korpus dokumentiv 1734–1775*, t. 1, Kyiv 1998, pp. 375–376, 220.

¹⁸ CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 29, fol. 152–152v.

¹⁹ CSHAUK, found 755, inv. 1, file 5, fol. 184.

²⁰ CSHAUK, found 752, inv. 1, file 13, fol. 12.

²¹ E. Rostworowski, *Polska w układzie sił politycznych Europy XVIII wieku*, [in:] *Polska w epoce Oświecenia. Państwo – społeczeństwo – kultura*, red. B. Leśnodorski, Warszawa 1971, pp. 44–45.

time, studies mention an extensive involvement of the Russian military men in the internal affairs of the Zaporizhia Host²². Taking into account the historical context, it is therefore necessary to distinguish the problem of the influence of the Russian military presence over the settlement of the territories of Zaporizhia in the period of New Sich.

It should be noted that such a presentation of the problem became possible due to a large number of studies on the history of Zaporizhia, based on the micro-historical approach and, what is more important, on a comprehensive source database. The intensive, and not descriptive, using of the documents from the Archives of New Sich Military Camp (*Kosh*) started relatively not long ago. The result of looking at the problem from a different perspective were the articles by Tetyana L. Kuzyk, Vladyslav V. Grybovsky, Oleh A. Repan and many other historians, referred to in this study. The latest synthesis summarising the history of Zaporizhia in the period of New Sich is a special chapter in the monograph by Viktor Brekhunenko on the subject under discussion²³.

Unfortunately, historians in other countries still rely on general works on the history of Zaporizhia, which are review works written within the context of historical perceptions, methodology and ideology²⁴ of that period, without an intensive analysis of the direct source database – the documents from the Archives of Zaporizhian Sich Military Camp. It should be noted that this remark is not intended to diminish the importance of those studies. However, without the inclusion of the latest Ukrainian research on the discussed subject, it will be by no means possible to get a full picture of historical processes taking place in that region. One of the most recent works on the history of Southern Ukraine is a monograph by the American historian, Brian L. Davies, on the Russo-Turkish War in 1768–1774, which described the Zaporizhia Host as part of the Black Sea Frontier of the Russian Empire. Unfortunately, it did not include the internal socio-political processes

²² O.A. Repan, *Vzayemnyy harnizonu Starosamars'koho retranshementu z mistsevym naseleennyam: koni ta navkolo nykh*, [in:] *Zaporoz'ka Sich i ukrayins'ke kozatstvo*, red. V.V. Kryvosheya, Kyiv 2013; idem, *Konfliktna vzayemodiya zalohy Lots-kam"yans'koho retranshementu z mistsevym naseleennyam u 1750–1760-kh rr.*, „Prydniprov'ya: istoryko-krayeznavchi doslidzhennya” 2016, t. 14; idem, *Komisiyi u Starosamars'komu retranshementi yak skladova vzayemodiya rosiiys'kykh viys'kovykh ta Kosha (1750–1760 rr.)*, „Naddnipyrians'ka Ukrayina: istorychni protsesy, podiyyi, postati” 2012, t. 10.

²³ V.A. Brekhunenko, *Skhidna brama Yevropy. Kozats'ka Ukrayina v seredyni XVII–XVIII st.*, Kyiv 2014, pp. 398–440.

²⁴ In particular, the Polish historian Leszek Podhorodecki, in the monograph *Sicz Zaporoska* (Warszawa 1970), relies on the study by the Ukrainian historian Volodymyr O. Holobutsky *Zaporoz'ke kozatstvo* (Kyiv 1995) and *Zaporiz'ka Sich v ostanni chasy svoho isnuvannya* (Kyiv 1961), presenting the history of Zaporizhia in the period of New Sich from the perspective of Marxist views. It is obvious that the monographs by Holobutsky did not analyse the processes of modernising Zaporizhia and the phenomenon of the Russian military presence as factors influencing Sich.

taking place in Zaporizhia in the period of New Sich and the conflict at the border between the Zaporizhia's inhabitants and the military settlements established in the territories of Zaporizhia, as well as the New Russia Governorate – these matters are considered precisely from the Russian imperial perspective²⁵.

Facts presented above confirm the usefulness of micro-historical approach in the process of examining the Zaporizhia Host as part of the European Frontier and they prove the need to prepare, on the basis of the conducted research, a new work of a general nature.

CONFESSIONAL CENSUS OF THE OLD-KODAK'S CHURCH DISTRICT AS A RESEARCH SOURCE ON THE STUDIES OF THE POPULATION STRUCTURE OF THE ZAPORIZHIAN *SLOBODAS*

Let us analyse the documentation on the Orthodox Church census of the Zaporizhia Host and, more precisely – the confessional books of the Old-Kodak's church district from 1766 and 1769. The first one has already been introduced to scholarly circulation by Lubov Gistsova²⁶, while the second one has not yet been used by researchers as source material on the history of Zaporizhia²⁷. In this work, the discussed confessional censuses are presented as a cross-section of a society in a certain, populated point, in the context of determining a specific time of residence of individual people in the Zaporizhian *slobodas* of Brygadyrivka (Danylivka) and Sokil'ska, with a note on their displacements. Informative potential of this kind of sources of a bookkeeping and statistic nature has already been analysed in details previously during a special source studies and works on historical demography²⁸. Confessional censuses are a type of a list of households of all the inhabitants of a given parish, with the indication of their age, sex, sometimes with the notes on the degree of kinship between the inhabitants of a household, and with an annotation whether a given parishioner went to confession (in the time of Lent). However, as was indicated by Oksana O. Romanova and Olena Zamura, confessional censuses often include distorted information about the population, particularly in regards to the population size, i.e. a clergyman could have excluded those members of congregation who did

²⁵ B.L. Davies, *The Russo-Turkish War, 1768–1774: Catherine II and the Ottoman Empire*, London 2015, pp. 79–82.

²⁶ L.Z. Gistsova, *Spovidna knyha Starokodats'koyi zaporoz'koyi hrestovoyi namistiyyi yak dzherelo do vyvchennya istoriyi poselen Volnostej viyskovykh*, „Sicheslavs'kyj almanah” 2006, t. 2, pp. 20–27.

²⁷ I wish to express my deep gratitude to Ms. Tetyana Kuzyk for providing information on the existence of the confessional census of the Old Kodak church district from 1769.

²⁸ See, for example, O. Sakalo, *Dzherela istorichnoyi demografyyi: spovidnyj rozpys*, „Naukovi zapysky. Zbirnyk prac molodyh vchenyh ta aspirantiv” 2009, t. 19, pp. 379–386.

not come to confession so that he would not be held responsible for the lack of diligence in performing his pastoral duties²⁹.

The process of making the censuses was also not always properly organised. On the basis of normative documents of the Synod, the census was supposed to be organised during Lent and submitted to the consistory before 1 October of a given year. However, there is a lot of evidence proving that the clergymen ended the census already towards the end of the second week of Lent although, in accordance to folk tradition, people tried to go to confession and take communion closer to the date of Lent's ending. This means that the clergyman made the census according to last year's model and then he could make corrections in it (in any case, only in the draft version since we will not find these corrections in the consistory's copies). In this case the document will not accurately reflect the composition of the parish's inhabitants. In other instances the clergymen approached the writing of the census in a careless manner: instead of conducting a direct survey about the composition of a family recorded during usual visits in the parish, they surveyed in an eatery and the parishioners' age was given at a guess or by comparing it with age of other residents, etc.³⁰

The confessional books of the Old Kodak's church district from 1766 and 1769 (consistory copies) have practically no corrections apart from additions of a few letters and a few minor deletions (one should mention here a book from 1766 because the copy from 1769 was made available to the author only in a form of a microfilm). However, some of the pages of the manuscript from 1766 have too compacted arrangements of the written verses and noticeable lack of overlapping of verses sections situated next to each other (with the number of houses and names of the parishioners). This indicates a breach in the procedure of the annual census of people due to the traditional use of last year's templates³¹.

Specificity of creating confessional censuses in the territories of the Zaporizhia Host was conditioned by the specificity of attitude of the Zaporizhian administration towards the population census and reluctance of the elders towards sending detailed data to anyone outside of their territory. For example, in 1761, the New Kodak cross governor, Stefan Andreyev (previously a clergyman of the Orthodox Church in New Kodak) tried to follow the instructions of the Kyiv Metropolitan regarding the census of the inhabitants subjected to the Old Kodak province, however, he had earlier turned for the permission to Kosh. The response

²⁹ O.O. Romanova, *Spovidal'ni knygy Kyivs'koyi mytropoliyi XVIII st. yak zasib kontrolyu za morallyu parafiyan*, "Ukrayins'kyj istorichnyy zhurnal" 2008, t. 4, pp. 123–125, 130; O. Zamura, *Velykyy shalenets. Smert' ta smertnist' u Getmanshyni XVIII st.*, Kyiv 2014, pp. 32–35.

³⁰ O.O. Romanova, *op. cit.*, pp. 125–128.

³¹ The lack of consistency in the verses is particularly visible, for example, in the confessional census from the town of Samarchyk, the centre of the Samarian *palanka* of the Zaporizhia Host (CSHAUK, found 127, inv. 1017, file 9, fol. 48–88b).

from Sich ordered the governor to write “not too much” and after finishing the census to send it to Kosh for approval. Comparison with other census documents (of Zaporizhia origins) shows that the number of population reflected in the confessional census after the “approval” from Sich was diminished at least twice³². It should be taken into consideration that this kind of “editing” was selective in nature. For example, in the *sloboda* of the Samara’s fortifications of Brygadyrivka (Danylivka), there were 46 households with 447 inhabitants (218 men and 229 women) recorded in the confessional book³³ and, in accordance with the registry on the settlements outside of the borderlines, the village had 100 houses in 1761³⁴. Indications in the confessional registries differ even more in comparison to data from other sources in the town of New Kodak, a centre for Kodak *palanka*, which was pointed out by Repan. According to the confessional list from 1766, there were 121 households and 1,262 inhabitants in the village, but the tax registry of Kosh from the same year recorded 270 households which were only of peasant origin³⁵ (Cossacks did not pay taxes, hence the Cossack households were not included). Additionally, it was not only because of the command of Kosh, who had a motive for undercutting the number of households, but also because of the authors of the confessional lists who wanted to diminish this way the amount of sums which were payable to the consistory³⁶.

The comparison of two confessional censuses of *sloboda* Brygadyrivka (Danylivka)³⁷ which are at our disposal shows that the same people were registered in various years under various names (pseudonyms)³⁸, their age indication

³² O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *Palimpsest. Korinnyia mista: poselennya XVI–XVIII st. v istoriyi Dnipropetrovs’ka*, Kyiv 2008, p. 129.

³³ CSHAUK, found 127, inv. 1017, file 9, fol. 104–118b.

³⁴ CSHAUK, found 51, inv. 3, file 13796, fol. 122–123.

³⁵ O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *op. cit.*, pp. 126–127. An underestimation of the number of residents of the Zaporizhian *slobodas* is manifested not only through the non-disclosure of a certain number of farms. The completeness of population census in the group under discussion (which *sloboda* is in this case) is determined as a result of dividing the total number of men by the total number of women. The ratio obtained in this way becomes an indicator of the number of men per 100 women. If the obtained ratio is less than 1, an underestimation of men in a given group can be taken into account (O. Zamura, *op. cit.*, p. 35). In turn, in the cited example of the *sloboda* of Brygadyrivka we can talk about the concealment of a certain number of male population in the confessional census because in this particular case the ratio was 0.95 (218 : 229).

³⁶ O. Zamura, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

³⁷ Confessional census 1766: CSHAUK, found 127, inv. 1017, file 9, fol. 104–118b; Confessional census 1769: CSHAUK, found 990, inv. 1, file 734, fol. 114–120b.

³⁸ This is referred to by the juxtaposition of family members by names, family relationship, age groups. For example, parishioners of Pokrovska church of village Brygadyrivka, a married Cossack Mykhaylo Piskovy in 1769 was registered as Mykhaylo Tkach, widow Horpyna Rybalchyha – as Horpyna Cherevychka, Vasyl’ Okhrymenko – as Vasyl’ Zhuk (CSHAUK, found 127, inv. 1017, file 9, fol. 117b–118b; found 990, inv. 1, file 734, fol. 120–120b).

was just a formality³⁹, and the category of household was treated freely – households from different neighbouring households from the first census were combined into one in the second census⁴⁰.

In fact, the analysis of the confessional books indicated that they are only a reflection of belonging of people to a specific parish in the Orthodox Church, without indicating the populated places these people live in (i.e. there was no indication of settlements that created the parish). Owing to the comparison between the Archives of Military Camp (Kosh) and the confessional censuses of the *sloboda*'s parish in Brygadyrivka (Danylivka) it was possible to differentiate a few households from the neighbouring *sloboda* of Sokil'na⁴¹ (other names: Sokol'naya, Sokil's'ka Reduta, Sokil's'ka).

Therefore, the data from the analysed confessional censuses (without citing

³⁹ Juxtaposition of the residents' age from two confessional censuses almost always proves that they do not overlap which also refers to "rejuvenation" of some children and many middle-aged and older residents (10 years or even more). The only exception are the families of the clergymen – Kurylo Kushchevski and Fedir Zelenski; of a deacon – Ivan Suchov; of a verger – Danylo Sen'. In the censuses from 1766 and 1769, their age differs by exactly three years. Even a psalmist (with whom, for obvious reasons, the clergyman had to deal with more often than with other parishioners), Pantelejmon Truskalo, was 10 years (!) "younger" in the census of 1769. The residents' age is often ended with number 2 (32, 82, 102, etc. in the census of 1766). These facts speak for themselves: creators of the confessional censuses did not aim at indicating a relatively exact age of their parishioners, which could have been done by a simple adding of years, without including censuses from previous years. It is obvious that the age was determined at a guess and "from memory", mainly through comparing it with the age of other members of the community of the same family.

⁴⁰ It should be assumed that the merging households into farmsteads also was of a strictly formal nature and was dependant on this quantitative indicator which had to be included in the final document. The comparison between the composition of residents shows that a household no. 46, in the census of 1766, was transformed into two neighbouring ones – no. 31–32 in the census of 1769, and no. 34 – into no. 18 and 19, respectively. Apart from this, the order of entries of the majority of households in the censuses of 1766 and 1769 is by no means overlapping (except for the households of clergymen and a few Cossack farms). It is doubtful whether this indicated a great scale of the population migration; it is more probable that we are dealing here with a lack of precise indicators from the consistory whether the huts from outside of the farms should be considered as separate farms or not (O. Zamura, *op. cit.*, p. 34).

⁴¹ Documents from the Archives of Kosh allow to determine that the families of Mykhaylo Piskovy (Tkach), of widows Horpyna Cherevchka (Rybalchycha) and Anastasia Tovstonizhka, and of Semen Mitlash (up until 1768 when he resettled to Kurylivka), ascribed to the parish of Brygadyrivka, lived in Sokil's'ka (CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 279, fol. 285b, 172b; CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 52, fol. 31; CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 238, fol. 9b). Taking into consideration the condition in 1763, the families of Ivan Wenzhela, Ivan Kolyada (estate no. 44, according to the census of 1766) and Samijl Zaredutnoh (no. 45, respectively) lived in Sokil's'ka (O.D. Sukhomlyn, *Konflikty yak element povsyakdennoyi vzyemodiyi naselennya slobody Sokils'koyi ta rosiys'kyh viyskovykh (1750–1760-ti rr.)*, „Istoriya i kultura Prydniprov'ya: nevidomi ta malovidomi storinky” 2013, t. 10, pp. 36–38), and it can be assumed that they lived there also in 1766. The above-mentioned families in Sokils'ka are not recorded in the confessional census in order (one after another), which can also indirectly suggest that some of the data on the households were concealed.

other synchronic sources which are examined below) can be used only to determine composition of members of the families involved, age groups, kinship degree between individual family members (i.e. son-in-law, nephew, parents and children). Nevertheless, this does not diminish a great significance of this type of source censuses also due to the fact that a modern researcher of this topic does not have at his/her disposal other censuses of families that lived in the Zaporizhian parishes.

SETTLEMENT BETWEEN THE OREL AND THE SAMARA RIVER BASINS VERSUS RUSSIAN FORTIFICATIONS

We will consider the processes of colonisation of the river basins between the Orel and the Samara, the northern patch of lands of the Zaporizhia Host, which was the most densely populated region of Zaporizhia. This territory was actively used by the residents of Poltava Oblast not only to carry on the seasonal economy – which was a continuation of the tradition of *ukhody*⁴² from the 17th century – but also in order to move to permanent places of residence. In the 18th century, the resettlement wave from the Hetmanate and the Right-bank Ukraine (which was a part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth) to the territories of Zaporizhia increased considerably; according to the condition from the 1730s, between the Orel and Samara River basins there were not only numerous *khutors* but also *slobodas* of people resettled from the Poltava Cossack regiment. Their existence is evidenced by the fact that the problem of a need for defence was taken into consideration by the Russian generals in 1743, at the time of considering a project on a new defensive line which should have been built more towards south than the already existing Ukrainian Line⁴³. The Russian commanders were interested in creating a defensive backup in the event of a new war against Turkey. In the documents from the Hetmanate, settlements situated south of the Orel River, after the Ukrainian Line had been built, were referred to as “off-line”.

The war period did not prevent the stream of national colonisation and settlement of people also in the vicinity of the new Russian fortresses. The problem of the return of those who had settled near Russian fortresses in the territory of Zaporizhia was addressed already in 1741 due to the incomplete number of Cossacks in the Poltava Regiment⁴⁴.

The war disturbed the re-settlers from Poorelia and other villages from the Hetmanate neither in overcoming dozens of *versts*, settling in the Zaporizhian

⁴² *Ukhod* – a place (often a type of wilderness) situated in the lower course of the Dnieper River, used for carrying out seasonal craftworks by the residents of the Ukrainian cities (in the 16th and 17th centuries).

⁴³ F.F. Laskovskiy, *Materialy dlya istorii inzhenernogo iskusstva v Rossii*, ch. 3, Sankt-Peterburg 1865, pp. 80–81.

⁴⁴ CSHAUK, found 59, inv. 1, file 1012, fol. 4–4b.

*slobodas*⁴⁵, the existing “off-line” settlements, comfortable ranges⁴⁶ and in the vicinity of the erected Russian fortifications and redoubts, nor in the carrying out traditional seasonal farming. For example, a Cossack family from the Poltava Cossack Regiment village of Kitaygorod (which initiated the establishment of the *sloboda* of Somivka (Sokils’ka) settled near the Sokil’s’yya Redoubt in 1739⁴⁷, and in the vicinity of the Birkutskyy fortification the village of Orlitska *sotnia* of the Poltava Regiment⁴⁸ of Birkut (other name: Revunivka⁴⁹) was settled, which suffered as a result of the Tatar attack in 1734⁵⁰ (other sources cite 1735 as the date of the next attack⁵¹).

In fact, the majority of the Russian fortresses in the territory of Zaporizhia were established in those towns which – as of the 1730s – were already to a greater or lesser extent controlled by people resettled from outside of the Orel River areas or by the Zaporizhians. This was conditioned by strategic significance of these towns – the presence in their vicinity of passages or intersections of key steppe roads, i.e. the passage right at the estuary of the Samara River, where the Samara fortification (*Ust’-samarskyy retrenchment*)⁵² and Mykolayivs’kyy Redoubt were “settled”, were used in the following ages⁵³. The same concerns the Bogoroditska

⁴⁵ Sixteen Cossack and 92 peasant families from the *sotnia* of the Poltava Regiment of Kytaygorod and Tsarychanka moved to Kodak and other Zaporizhian settlements already in March 1736 (O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *op. cit.*, p. 122).

⁴⁶ Registry of the off-line settlements from 1762 recorded migrants from different places who moved to the interfluvial area of the Orel and Samara Rivers (beyond the Ukrainian Line) from 1736 (village of Kurylivka, *sotnia* of Kytaygorod), in 1737, 1738, and 1739 (on territory of *sotnia* of Nehvorochsha) (CSHAUK, found 51, inv. 3, file 13796, fol. 104, 69, 74, 75b). However, the census included only those residents who lived beyond the Orel River continuously (from the second half of the 1730s until the time the registry was written, i.e. to the second half of the 1750s–1762), without including the deceased and those who did not manage to move to another place.

⁴⁷ D.I. Evarnitskiy, *Istochniki dlya istorii zaporozhskih kozakov*, t. 2, Vladimir 1903, p. 1714.

⁴⁸ CSHAUK, found 59, inv. 1, file 1012, fol 4b. Affiliation of Birkut (Revunivka) was confirmed by the decree of the General Military Chancellery of Hetmanate of 14 April 1743 (CSHAUK, found 269, inv. 1, file 303, fol. 2–2b).

⁴⁹ D.I. Evarnitskiy, *op. cit.*, p. 1708, 1714.

⁵⁰ In a letter addressed to the Koshovyy Otaman, Ivan Malashevich, the Kyiv General-Governor, Johann Weysbach, wrote that the attack of Nogay Tatars on the village of Birkut (which belonged to the Poltava Cossack Regiment) during the night on 4 February 1734 was the evidence of disrupting peace between the Russian Empire and the Porte (*Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz’koyi Sichi...*, t. 1, p. 53).

⁵¹ O.M. Apanovych, *Zbrojni syly Ukrainy pershoyi polovyny XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1969, p. 128.

⁵² At present, the remains of the defences in the Ust-Samara Fortification are situated on the island of Mojka within the area of the modern city of Dnieper (areas of the Igren Peninsula).

⁵³ A place at the estuary of the Samara River is the most convenient for the crossing due to being near the second flood terrace and limited width of the Samara – in the summer of 1736, the river was 27 fathoms and 5.5 feet wide, i.e. 242.6 m (O.V. Malov, V.O. Veklenko, A.V. Veklenko, *op. cit.*, p. 120). Another similar place was situated much higher up the Samara River, not far from the future Bogorodyts’ka fortress. Due to a wide flood plain of the Samara River, there were no con-

fortress – the Old-Samara fortification (*Starosamarskyy retrenchment*) (the town of Samara is known from the 16th century), Kodatskyy Redoubt (Kamyanka, sloboda near the New Kodak crossing), Birkutskyy fortification (*Birkutskyy retrenchment*) (the already mentioned village of Birkut), Sokil's'kyy (arable lands of the residents of the town of the Poltava regiment –Perevolochna) – this list could be continued.

Running the farms by the residents of Poorillia outside of the Ukrainian Line – which had been an ordinary practice for them for decades – was interesting not only to the elders of the “Orel towns of the Poltava Cossack Regiment” but also to the Russian commanders of various ranks. Apart from purely practical considerations (the need to run the farms by the residents of Poorillia from whom the majority of lands were taken away due to the building of the Ukrainian Line and the settlement of the land militia regiments there, which would prevent them from paying taxes for the maintenance of the Russian troops full time) like the need to cross the residents over the Orel River, the Russian command was also guided by other motives.

In accordance with a suggestion of General Field Marshal Burkhard von Münich, General Major Devits demanded in a written order from 24 May 1738 that all the fortresses of the Ukrainian Line should let the “citizens” cross the line in connection with the necessity to tillage, sowing and hay harvest. According to the generals, the place was well-defended from the Tatar attacks because it was protected by the Samara fortifications and the outposts situated along the Dnieper and Samara Rivers⁵⁴. There were also decrees by the local commanders, i.e. a written order by colonel of the Livensky land militia regiment Duke Urusov on a smooth passing of the residents over the line to graze cattle and cultivate cereals⁵⁵. In the situation when the traffic through the Ukrainian Line was fully dependent on the

venient exits to the second flood terrace along the entire section (Voyenno-topograficheskaya karta Yekaterinoslavskoy gubernii, list 27, ryad 13, 1850s). It was right at the mouth of the Samara, when the fortification of Ust-Samara was then built during the crossing, that the Zaporizhians arranged traps in the 16th and 17th c., and in 1647, the army of Jeremi Wiśniowiecki crossed over (Z.P. Marina, D.G. Filimonov, *Do pitannya pro misceznahodzhennya slobody ta perevoziv bilya Ust-Samarskogo retranshementu (za pysemnymy ta arheologichnymy danymy)*, „Muzeynyj visnyk” 2009, t. 9, p. 69). During the construction of the Ust-Samara stronghold, the remains of defensive structures – of a fortress built probably at the same time as that of Bogorodyts'ka fortress, in 1688 – were used (A.K. Bayov, *Russkaya armiya v carstvovanie imperatricy Anny Ioannovny. Vojna Rossii s Turciej v 1736–1739 gg. Pervye tri goda vojny*, Sankt-Peterburg 1909, p. 235; O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *op. cit.*, p. 93).

⁵⁴ In the autumn of 1736, a line of outposts, which were situated at a distance of 2–6 *versts* from each other, was created on the left bank of the Dnieper River, from the estuary of the Orel to the estuary of the Samara Rivers. Their garrisons consisted mainly of Cossacks from the Hetmanate's regiments, but also of Cossacks who returned from the expedition of the Russian army to Crimea (see more CSHAUK, found 51, inv. 3, file 5703).

⁵⁵ CSHAUK, found 51, inv. 3, file 7016, fol. 2–2b.

will of the Russian commanders, the passing of the residents across the line for the purpose of harvesting in August 1738 was taken care of by colonel of the Poltava Cossack regiment, Vasil Kochubey⁵⁶. However, the case concerned his own interest since he owned arable lands, ponds and apiaries across the Orel River⁵⁷.

Representatives of Poltava Land, especially those whose origins were from the town of Kytaygorod, had used the lands across the Orel River long before the Ukrainian Line was built. As of 1732, 19 Cossack *khutors* of that *sotnia* were recorded across the Orel River⁵⁸.

On the basis of the Russian generals' opinion, expressed at the beginning of the 1740s, the request of the orelian *sotnias* regarding the running of *khutors* situated south of the Ukrainian Line was to be met because their lands had been taken away for the settlement of the land militia regiments. However, they should not be settled south of the Samara River⁵⁹. These decisions could be explained by a great convenience while supplying the army in the event of another Russo-Turkish war because with a sufficient settlement in the area between the Orel and Samara rivers, food and carts, etc. could be arranged not in the Hetmanate but closer to the direct theatre of war activities. This thesis is also supported by the recommendation (November 1740 – beginning of December 1741) of the then *generalissimus* of the Russian army, Anthony Ulrich of Brunswick-Lüneburg, on not deporting the Cossacks and peasants from the Hetmanate who had already been settled near the fortifications of Ust-Samara and Mishurin Rog, regardless of the demands and protests from the General Military Chancellery. The latter lied in the fact that many fine Cossacks and supporters moved together with their families and wealth from the Poltava Regiment to the new *slobodas* situated next to the Russian fortresses which caused the incompleteness of the regiment⁶⁰.

However, the populating of *slobodas* situated next to the Russian fortresses was not carried out for long. As of 1742, there were 159 inhabitants by the Ust-Samara fortification, 12 – by Kamyansky, 9 – by Nienasytets, and 18 people from the Hetmanate – by the Birkutsky Redoubt⁶¹, but already in the spring of

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, fol. 6.

⁵⁷ G.K. Shvyd'ko, *Ostanni sprobny zaporozhtsiv vidstoyaty svoiy volnosti*, „Pivdenna Ukrayina XVIII–XIX st.: Zapiski naukovo-doslidnoyi laboratoriyi istoriyi Pivdennoyi Ukrayiny Zaporiz'kogo derzhavnogo universytetu” 1996, t. 2, p. 14.

⁵⁸ Institute of Manuscripts of the National Library of Ukraine named after V. Vernadsky, found 1, file 54335, fol. 222. In the following years, these *khutors* grew to the size of villages which – in 1764–1765 – became subjected to the Zaporizhia Host and gave rise to the Protovchanska *palanka* (currently, a territory of Petrykivka, partly of Mahdalynivka, Dnipropetrovsk, and Tsarychanka Districts of Dnipropetrovsk Oblast).

⁵⁹ G.K. Shvyd'ko, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

⁶⁰ CSHAUK, found 59, inv. 1, file 1012, fol. 4–4b.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

1743 there was not even one resident by Ust-Samara (apart from three *lotsman*)⁶², there remained only 10 people “having no housing” by the Kamyanka fortification, while the new re-settlers did not arrive at all⁶³.

Sudden depopulation of settlements situated next to the Russian fortifications was depended on a few reasons. The first one was a transfer of subordination of part of those settlements from the Kyiv General-Governor Mihail Leontiev to the jurisdiction of the Hetmanate: a special kind of *sotnia* was established (with a centre in Old Samara) which included Cossack and peasant (common) people from the *slobodas* of Ust-Samara, Kamyanka and Nienasytets fortifications⁶⁴. Anticipating the facts, I will emphasise that the Russian generals – justifying in the mid-1760s the liquidation of Zaporizhian Sich – blamed the Zaporizhians for the “destruction” of settlements placed by the Russian fortifications that have already been mentioned before⁶⁵.

The second reason for the sudden decrease in the number of inhabitants of the *slobodas* which were placed near the fortresses was their lack of adjustment to permanent residence by the rural population. Fortifications and redoubts were erected by the army in strategically important places, the choice of which depended on a number of functions imposed on this or other fortifying structure. Taking into consideration the defensive functions, stronghold was supposed to be situated usually on a hill which gave the possibility of firing around it. Due to the lack of sufficient long-term observations on the topic of river flooding, the fortresses

⁶² *Lotsman* was taking care of marking a navigable route. Sometimes he arranged river crossing.

⁶³ CSHAUK, found 59, inv. 1, file 1012, fol. 9. *Sloboda* by the Old Samara stronghold is an exception. An unspecified number of newcomers from the Hetmanate – who had lived so far by the Ust-Samara stronghold – arrived here in 1741; in 1742 – there were 219 newcomers and in 1744 – 439 migrants (O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *op. cit.*, p. 127).

⁶⁴ CSHAUK, found 59, inv. 1, file 1012, fol. 4. Subordinating these *slobodas* to the Kiev General-Governor was implemented through subordinating a commander of the Ust-Samara (and after its liquidation – Old-Samara) fortification and commanders of other fortresses who reported to him. It is an obvious matter that the Russian command was not in a hurry to put taxes on people which cannot be said about the representatives of the Hetmanate’s administration who aimed at the quickest reconstruction of the complete Poltava regiment by means of purposely created *sotnia* of Old Samara. For example, in 1751, a clergyman of Danylivka (Brygadyrivka) *sloboda*, Symeon Levitski, before sending a complaint to the Poltavian Orthodox consistory – that is, his immediate superior – about the attack on the *slobodas* by the Zaporizhian division under the command of Martyn Serdechny, a Cossack captain of the Kodak *palanka*, had reported on this incident using the following phrase: “To the commandant of the Old Samara stronghold, to the garrison’s office” (“Starosamar-skogo pravleniya glavnomu komandiru, k shtabu garnizonnykh del”) (T.L. Kuzyk, *Perekhid zhyteliv slobody Danylivky u piddannstvo Viys'ka Zaporoz'kogo Nizovogo*, „Ukrayins'kyy arheografichnyy shchorichnyk” 2007, t. 12, pp. 418–419).

⁶⁵ V.I. Mil'chev, Yu.P. Knyaz'kov, *Proekt reformuvannya ustroyu Zaporozhzhya general-majora Karla Shtofelna (1765 r.)*, „Zapysky naukovo-doslidnoyi laboratoriyi istoriyi Pivdennoyi Ukrainy Zaporiz'kogo derzhavnogo universytetu” 2003, t. 7, p. 40.

which had been built or had just their foundations were often flooded which was the reason for moving them to other, higher locations⁶⁶. Since the fortresses by the Dnieper River were planned as bases for the flotilla, it was the most important to locate the fortifications at the same time and on a hill towering over the surroundings (which is determined by the need for defence), and, simultaneously, as close as possible to the riverbed, in a place with depth that was sufficient for the dock to operate⁶⁷.

Let us consider, for example, the location of the Ust-Samara fortification which was chosen due to a number of strategically important factors, amongst them: presence of a towering hill on a rocky ridge of the shore (from which the banks of the Dnieper River can be seen well), close proximity to the estuary of the Samara River which allowed to arrange crossing to its right bank (the way out of the crossing was protected there by the rebound of St Nicolas) as well as the right bank of the Dnieper River (where the fortifications of Kamyanka were being built), sufficient depth of the riverbed, humus-sandy composition of the topsoil (which made it possible to build defensive soil fortifications, in contrast to the surrounding aeolian sands present at the Igren Peninsula)⁶⁸, and many more. In fact, it is the only convenient place for a large base for supplies and a fleet base situated directly before the thresholds of the Dnieper. However, due to a unique landform, the hill, on which the Ust-Samara fortification was situated, was becoming a pen-

⁶⁶ For instance, the Oleksandrivska fortress (now city of Zaporizhzhya) of the New Dnieper Line was moved 1.5 km towards the Sukha Moskovka River as a result of spring flooding of the Mokra Moskovka River in 1771 (R.L. Moldavsky, *Nova Dniprovska liniya ukriplen' (1770–1791 rr.)*, Zaporizhzhya 2007, p. 31). However, similar cases took place also where the lack of observation of spring flooding was unacceptable. A few outposts on the border of the Hetmanate and the Commonwealth in the Starodub Regiment did not have a permanent residence and could move during winter or spring in case of flooding or icing (O.I. Gurzhiy, *Polityko-administratyvne j terytorial'ne reformuvannya Getmanshyny u XVIII st.: prychny, perebig, naslidky*, Kyiv 2015, p. 39).

⁶⁷ It should be taken into account that due to the rising of water level by means of the hydroelectric dam, the shores of the Dnieper and the rivers that flowed into it were surrounded by flood plains which were covered in water each year and the depth of water by the shore was always small. Large areas of flood plains by the estuary of the Samara River are well visible on the military-topographic map of the Yekaterinoslav Governorate from the 1850s (O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *op. cit.*, p. 229). Due to extensive flood plains, the Bogorodits'ka fortress was built on a steep right bank of the Samara River, at a great distance from the estuary of the Dnieper River. At the same time, navigation was significantly impeded even for relatively small ships (*strugi*) as a result of the shallowing of the Dnieper in the summer (*ibidem*, p. 81).

⁶⁸ Small plots of land with a level of this type of soil were sunk after the hydroelectric dam had been built and they have survived to this day on the banks of the Dnieper River, exactly across from the present island of Moyka. It was due to the presence of a fertile chernozem-sandy level of soil that the place in which the defensive buildings of the Ust-Samara Fortification had been situated was in a later period used for cultivation purposes by the residents of Old Igren (Z.P. Marina, D.G. Filimonov, *op. cit.*, p. 67).

insula or even an island during the spring floods⁶⁹. Therefore, the *sloboda* next to the fortification was exposed to temporary flooding.

We see similar conditions of situating the fortifications in relation to the Russian redoubts in the Orel and Samara interfluvium. As is proven by the cartographic material cited by Fiodor. Laskovski and the data from the maps of the 18th and 19th centuries, the fortification of Birkut (later reduced to a redoubt rank) was situated at the shore of Lake Birkut, the Sokil's'ky redoubt – on a steep bank of the river Somivka (Sokilka), and Kodak – directly on the shoreline of the Dnieper River. Direct location of Romaniv's'ky Redoubt⁷⁰, which was situated between contemporary villages of Kurylivka and Nikolayivka of the Pietrykivka's District in Dnipropetrovsk Oblast, has not been explained so far. However, taking into consideration the nature of that place it can be assumed that the redoubt should have been placed on a small hill towering over the first terrace of the flood plain on the left bank of the Dnieper River.

Scale of the movement of people from the Poltava Cossack Regiment to the left bank of the Orel River without them taking into account the dangers of war, presence amongst them of a significant number of not poor representatives of the left bank Cossacks and peasants⁷¹, numerous petitions from the elders of the Poltava Cossacks on the permission to run farms outside of the Ukrainian Line prove that the active economic expansion and the usage of the Zaporizhian lands was something ordinary and agreeable with tradition to the migrants. This offers grounds to state that the Russian fortresses were not a catalyst during the colonisa-

⁶⁹ This is evidenced by the study on altitude points on a large map created for the building of the hydroelectric power plant Dnieprogres (Plan goroda Dnepropetrovska i yego blizhajshih okrestnostej, 1929–1932. Masshtab 1:10 000). Situating the fortress of Ust-Samara on a hill was in fact protecting from flooding only the internal, earth fortification (its fragments were preserved on the present-day island of Moyka), while the external earth embankment (not to mention the tollgates situated lower, directly on the bank of the Dnieper River) was annually sunk by spring flooding of the Dnieper. This is also mentioned by the accounts of the local historians from the 1920s (Z.P. Marina, D.G. Filimonov, *op. cit.*, p. 67). However, one should not confuse the island located on the Dnieper and across from the fortifications (currently sunken), which was also used by the Russian army for the purpose of storing building materials, with the costal hill on which the fortress was indeed located. It was this island that was referred to as “Ust-Samara Island” in the documents of Zaporizhian Sich (*Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Stichi. Korpus dokumentiv 1734–1775*, t. 2, Kyiv 2000, p. 70).

⁷⁰ F.F. Laskovskiy, *Karty, plany i chertezhi k 3-j chasti Materialov dlya istorii inzhenernogo iskusstva v Rossii*, Sankt-Peterburg 1866, pp. 3–4; *Dostov'rnaya landkarta me"zh re"k Dnepra i Dontsa na razstoyaniyakh ot ust'ya Samary do Izyuma i Luganskoy stanitsy sochinennaya 1749 goda v sentyabr" i oktyabr" mesyatsakh*, [in:] V.S. Starostin, *Stolytsya Shidnogo Zaporozhzhya*, „Frontyry mista: istoryko-kulturologichnyy almanah” 2013, t. 3, pp. 39–61; Voyenno-topograficheskaya karta Yekaterinoslavskoy gubernii, list 27, ryad 13.

⁷¹ The former *starosta* of the town of Kyshen'ka of the Poltava Cossack Regiment, Klym Protzenko, was recalled amongst the migrants particularly at the beginning of the 1740s (O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *op. cit.*, p. 125).

tion of the territories of the Zaporizhia Host, but they rather played a role of the next “step” in this developing and inevitable process.

The third reason for depopulating the settlements created by the Russian fortresses right after the war in 1735–1739 was the influence (but not yet targeted colonisation politics) of the Zaporizhia Host, which will be discussed below.

ATTEMPTS TO EXTEND THE RUSSIAN GARRISONS’ POWER IN THE TERRITORY OF ZAPORIZHIA AND THE SETTLEMENT OF PEOPLE IN THE VICINITY OF FORTRESSES

As has already been mentioned above, the Russian command was interested in colonising the subsidiaries of the future theatre of the Russo-Turkish War, the part of which could have been Zaporizhia. From this point of view in particular, it was of primary importance to colonise the *slobodas* in the vicinity of the newly built fortresses. Already in 1741, a decree was issued which allowed the refugees from the Right-bank Ukraine, the Hetmanate and also the Russian governorates to settle next to the Russian strongholds⁷².

The Russian imperial power aimed at accumulating a mobile Ukrainian population near the fortresses that were rebuilt. However, such attempts were made not only by the central authorities (represented by the Kiev General-Governor), but also on the basis of a decree by the Russian commanders of the Ukrainian Land Militia Corps, issued on the initiative of a sergeant of the Old-Samaritan *sotnia*. In 1742, the Kiev General-Governor, Mihail Leontiev, dispatched a Russian team commanded by a captain, Ulianin, of the Shlisselburg Regiment to Zaporizhia, who recorded the presence in the Zaporizhian village of Wolne⁷³ of activities associated with production of saltpetre – *maydanshchyna* to which Apachynin, a foreman, was connected. At the request of the ataman, *maydanshchyna* was left intact, but the captain chased away the settlement from the Hetmanate and Old Samara (which was led by Dragatienko, a Cossack from the Poltava Regiment), situated near the village of Vil’ne (located 40 *versts* from Old Samara). Residents from Old Samara were sent back by the captain to their village and those from the Hetmanate – to the places of their previous residence⁷⁴.

In the middle of March 1747, the commander of the Land Militia Corps, General-Lieutenant Michail Filosofov, ordered the commandant of the Ust-Samara fortification, Major Artiom Pozniakov (who was simultaneously a com-

⁷² D.I. Evarnitskiy, *op. cit.*, p. 1386.

⁷³ At present, it is the village of Vil’ne of Novomoskovsk District (*rayon*) in Dnipropetrovsk Oblast.

⁷⁴ D.I. Evarnitskiy, *op. cit.*, pp. 1707–1709.

mander of all the Russian garrisons in the territories of Zaporizhia), to turn back – with the help of a specially commanded Russian patrol – absolutely all of those who came from Old Samara and settled in various Zaporizhian *khutors* and the steppe (migration area included up to 50 *versts*) together with their families and fortune. Importantly, the commander of the Low Dnieper team was on the other hand supposed to oversee that no one would move from the town to the steppe, and that ordinary people, as it had been before, lived “under the protection” of the Russian fortresses. Displacements done with the help of the Russian soldiers had been initiated by the Old Samarian *sotnik*, Maxim Zub, motivating his request with the statement that the re-settlers were assigned to the *sotnia* but were not on duty and they did not fulfill their duty, and moreover, they could fall victims to the Tatar attack. Report on this matter from the Regiment Chancellery of Poltava was received by General-Lieutenant Filosofov on 3 March⁷⁵, and already before 13 March, a division was sent by the main Major Pozniakov⁷⁶. Such operability excellently demonstrates the interest of the Russian commanders in the problem of the population settlement next to the Russian fortresses in the territories of the Zaporizhian Host.

The troop recalled from the Ust-Samara fortification was commanded by Ensign Ivan Svierchkov and consisted of 20 Russian soldiers and some Cossacks from the left bank Ukraine. They arrived in the town of Vil’ne to make an official census of settlers who were migrants from Old Samara. The Zaporizhian group from the Samarian *palanka* prevented the forced displacement and, presenting their weapons, chased the Russian unit away⁷⁷.

In parallel with the state policy of colonisation of Zaporizhia (confirmed by an agreement to settle next to the Russian fortresses and then attempts to forcibly turning mobile people away to the strongholds), there were numerous cases of private initiatives of the Russian officers who – while besieging the *slobodas* – sought to enrich themselves at the expense of “free” resources of the Zaporizhian Host. This phenomenon could be observed throughout the entire period of the history of New Sich and it was related not only to the *slobodas* founded by the Russian officers (stationed at the Ukrainian Line) on the left bank on the Orel River⁷⁸, which was considered by the Zaporizhians as theirs. Already in 1742, the commander of the New Sich fortification, Lieutenant Raievskiy, settled his *khutor*

⁷⁵ CSHAUK, found 59, inv. 1, file 1377, fol. 46.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, fol. 48.

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, fol. 49–49b.

⁷⁸ For example, *slobodas* of a lieutenant of Duke Baratov, major of the hussar regiment, of the then colonel Sztofeln (CSHAUK, found 51, inv. 3, file 13796, fol. 113b, 53, 55b, 59) and others; residents of the *khutors* coming from the same place, from the fortresses of the Ukrainian Fortification Line, i.e. Boklagin, Filipov, Boklagin from the fortress of Saint Fiodor of the Ukrainian Line (*ibidem*, fol. 69) and many others.

on the “free” territories, about which the Zaporizhians complained in a petition addressed to the Empress Elizabeth Petrovna (1743)⁷⁹.

In 1774, the Koshovyi Otaman Petro Kalnyshevsky complained in a petition to Catherine II about the commanders of the Russian strongholds which were settling private *khutors* and *slobodas* in the territories of the Host⁸⁰. The Russian officers always aimed at extending their authority at the local level over the Zaporizhian lands, which was achieved by taking over lands and arbitrarily placing guards on them, but also by attempts of subjugation. For example, Cossack Kyrylo Globa from *sloboda* Polovytsya of the Kodak *palanka*⁸¹ complained to the Koshovyi Otaman in 1774 that the commander of the Old Samara fortification, the main Major Alexandr Riazancev, was detaining a brother of his serf’s wife⁸². Apart from that, the territories around the Russian fortifications in the Zaporizhian lands – including the direct subordination of the *slobodas*, which were just recently settled (in the first years after the war), to the Kiev General-Governor (through the commander of the Ust-Samara fortification) – were treated by the Russian authorities as the possessions of the Russian Empire⁸³. The notion of the areas around the fortresses as a “Russian” territory is confirmed also by the words of the Ust-Samara fortification commander, which were answer to a complaint made by the Crimean Tatar from whom the Zaporizhians had stolen a few head of cattle (1740). This commander (“commander of Ust-Samara”) answered that had those Zaporizhians dragged the cattle *directly to* (stressed added by the author) he could have influenced the situation⁸⁴. This means that the authority of the commander extended (according to him) also beyond the boundaries of the fortification, in some sort of a limited zone. There was probably a reference here to the *sloboda* of Ust-Samara.

The local Russian commanders, often taking advantage of a stronger person’s law or abusing their official position, sought to enrich themselves at the expense of settling a small *sloboda* on the “free” Zaporizhian lands. The most famous and notorious example was a commander of the Perevoloczna stronghold, Brigadier Danylo Apachynin. His stationing for a long time was associated with Southern Ukraine. At the beginning of the 1730s, he – at that time still a lieutenant – was entrusted with forming the Ukrainian Land Militia corps from amongst residents coming from the neighbouring farmhouses’ units in Belgorod and Sevsk⁸⁵, he was

⁷⁹ D.I. Evarnitskiy, *op. cit.*, p. 1336.

⁸⁰ *Petro Kalnyshevs'kyj ta yogo doba. Dokumenty ta materialy*, red. V. Grybovsky, V. Milchev, I. Syniak, Kyiv 2009, p. 309.

⁸¹ At present, a city of Dnieper.

⁸² *Petro Kalnyshevs'kyj...*, p. 178.

⁸³ V.I. Mil’chev, Yu.P. Knyaz’kov, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁸⁴ *Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi...*, t. 2, p. 222.

⁸⁵ R.L. Moldavsky, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

appointed a commander of the Perevoloczna fortress in the time of the Russo-Turkish War together with the promotion to the rank of a brigadier⁸⁶, and right after the war, at the beginning of the 1740s, Apachynin commanded the “Dnieper posts”, i.e. all the Russian fortresses in the territory of Zaporizhia⁸⁷. All his appointments are enough to understand the seriousness and significance of the brigadier’s authority in the territory in question. While explaining to the Kiev General-Governor, Mihail Leontiev, the fact of owing *slobodas* in the territory of the Host he noted that they had been necessary for “feeding [...] in all his constant efforts” because he was surviving only on his salary, and he had asked for a permission to settle at least a few families⁸⁸.

In 1741, Apachynin purchased land between the rivers of Sokilka and Somivka, together with the wilderness of Trytuzne; at the time of the transaction an arable field had already been there. The land was being sold by the resident of the town Perevoloczna, Varvara Fedoryha, stating that she had received the arable lands as inheritance from her uncle. Apachynin began to colonise the *sloboda* of Somivka “under the protection of the cannons” of the Sokil’s’kyy Redoubt which had 2 families in 1742. He also moved the *sloboda* of Trytuzne to the vicinity of Romanivs’kyy Redoubt, and in that same year there were already 15 Cossacks together with their families who came from the Hetmanate, Slobozhanshchyna and the Right-bank Ukraine⁸⁹. In autumn of 1742, there occurred a problem related to the displacement of those settled by Apachynin in the *slobodas*, but the Hetmanate elders – being part of the commission – acknowledged the lands from the Romanivs’kyy Redoubt as belonging to the Poltavian Regiment; however, due to Apachynin’s petition to the Senate, the *slobodas* were left alone. In 1751, Danylivka (Brygadyryvka) was handed over to the Zaporizhian Army, first to the Kodak *palanka*⁹⁰, and then to the Samara *palanka*⁹¹.

However, the settlement near the Sokil’s’kyy Redoubt dates back even to 1739 when Andriy Gordychenko from Kytaygorod settled there together with his family⁹², and thus the foreman’s efforts were actually aimed at increasing the number of population in the already existing *sloboda*.

As has already been mentioned, the settlement next to Birkut – when the Russian fortification was later built – had been created already before the Russo-Turkish War of 1735–1739. Then, it is recorded as “Revunivka” in the docu-

⁸⁶ A.K. Bayov *Russkaya armiya v carstvovanie imperatricy Anny Ioannovny. Vojna Rossii s Turciej v 1736–1739 gg. Kampaniya 1739 goda*, Sankt-Peterburg 1909, p. 74.

⁸⁷ CSHAUK, found 59, inv. 1, file 781, fol. 23.

⁸⁸ D.I. Evarnitskiy, *op. cit.*, p. 1711.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, pp. 1711–1714.

⁹⁰ T.L. Kuzyk, *Perekhid...*, p. 416.

⁹¹ D.I. Evarnitskiy, *op. cit.*, pp. 1708, 1711, 1713–1714.

⁹² *Ibidem*, p. 1708.

ments from the Archives of Zaporizhian Military Camp (Kosh). Revunivka or Revukivka *sloboda* is precisely located by the cartographic sources from the 18th and 19th centuries to the area south of the Birkut fortification (Birkutskyy Redoubt)⁹³. There were Cossack winter quarters right next to the village⁹⁴. The *sloboda* was also handed over to the jurisdiction of the Zaporizhia probably between 1751 and 1754⁹⁵, right after Danylivka, and assigned to the Samara's *palanka*. According to the situation in 1756, the *sloboda* had 20 service farms (which had draught cattle) and 34 pedestrian ones⁹⁶.

Sloboda Sokil's'ka (other name – Sokil's'kyy Redoubt), situated not far from the redoubt and in the past also owned by Brygadier Apachynin, was similarly assigned to the Samara's *palanka* (the date of moving it under the jurisdiction of the Zaporizhian Host are impossible to be determined for now). In accordance with the Zaporizhian tax census from 1754 and 1756, there were 32 peasant yards (farms)⁹⁷ and according to the census from 1764 – 47 farms⁹⁸. The census of Cossacks from the Samara District (*uyezd*) from 5 February 1776 recorded 8 married, equestrian Cossacks in the *sloboda* of the Sokil'skyy Redoubt⁹⁹. On the basis of data from the *Atlas of Ekaterinoslav Governorate*, the “village” Sokol'skaya belonged in 1787 to Cadet Gersievanov, it had 1,500 *dessiatines* of arable land and 985 of wasteland, 20 males and 12 females¹⁰⁰.

Considering the fate of “re-redoubts” as populated places, it can be stated that those settlements existed the longest and archived the greatest development (it is even possible in the case of the Zaporizhian *slobodas*) which had been founded without being subjected to the Russian fortifications by those who came from the Poltava region and knew very well the village due to a long-lasting tradition

⁹³ Voenno-topograficheskaya karta Yekaterinoslavskoy gubernii, list 27, ryad 13; O.D. Sukhomlyn, *Problemy lokalizatsiyi ta funkcionuvannya redutiv XVIII st. u mezhyrichchi Orelit Samary*, „Prydniprov'ya: istoryko-krayeznavchi doslidzhennya” 2012/2013, t. 11, p. 33.

⁹⁴ *Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi. Korpus dokumentiv 1734–1775*, t. 4, Kyiv 2006, p. 268, 270, 320.

⁹⁵ In 1755, officials from the Poltava Cossack regiment chancellery were once again not allowed to enter Revunivka (*Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi. Korpus dokumentiv 1734–1775*, t. 3, Kyiv 2003, p. 265). In the autumn of 1756, in the correspondence of the Hetmanate administration with the Zaporizhia Host's Kosh – on the payments of outstanding taxes on moving the off-line *slobodas* under the jurisdiction of Zaporizhia – Revunivka is also mentioned right next to Danylivka (CSHAUK, found 269, inv. 1, file 1803, fol. 1).

⁹⁶ CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 52, fol. 3.

⁹⁷ *Ibidem*, fol. 3, 22.

⁹⁸ *Ibidem*, file 279, fol. 150.

⁹⁹ The Russian National Archives of Historical Documents (hereinafter: RNAHD), found 16, inv. 1, file 747, part. 1, fol. 441b. I would like to express my gratitude to Mr. Petro Boyko for granting me access to the photocopies of this document.

¹⁰⁰ *Dzherela z istoriyi Pivdennoyi Ukrayiny*, t. 10: *Opysy Stepovoyi Ukrayiny ostannoyi chverti XVIII – pochatku XIX stolittya*, red. A. Boyko, Zaporizhzhya 2009, p. 153.

of farming in these areas. For example, Birkut-Revunivka *sloboda* survived as a rural settlement in fact from the beginning of the 18th century to the middle of the 20th century. On the other hand, Danylivka-Brygadyrivka, founded by Russian offices and assigned to the Romanovska Redoubt, remained only a *khutor* in the 19th century, while any trace after Sokil'ska Redoubt was completely lost in the 19th century¹⁰¹.

SETTLEMENT OF THE ZAPORIZHIAN *SLOBODAS* IN THE INTERFLUVE OF THE OREL AND SAMARA RIVERS

The question of permanence of inhabited points as places colonised permanently rises a problem of populating stability. Unsubstantiated thesis on a high level of population migration functions commonly in the historiography of Zaporizhia. Up until the 1750s, people displaced from Ukraine who settled in Zaporizhia, would quite often move from place to place, or completely abandoned the territories of the Zaporizhian Host (the Zaporizhian administration did not control where these people would go), due to the uncertain situation and in connection with repetitive attempts by the Hetmanate's elders to turn them back to their family *sotnia*. The Kodak *palanka* in particular lost 154 families in 1754¹⁰². Simultaneously, it is possible to observe an annual increase in the number of those who were resettled from the Old Samara *sotnia* to the Zaporizhian *slobodas* and towns: from the summer to the end of the autumn of 1753, the population of Old Samara decreased by 23 farms¹⁰³. As of 1757, the Old Samara *sotnia* lost 298 people (we have heads of the families in mind), including calculations from the previous years¹⁰⁴. And once again, people who resettle are not only the poor, but also the representatives of the former elders in the *sotnia* (e.g. the writer – Dmytro Lelitka)¹⁰⁵.

High mobility of population of the new *slobodas* and *khutors* from beyond the Orel River was observed not only in the times of the Russo-Turkish War (1735–1739), but also in the post-war, peaceful period. Quite frequently, the displaced had changed their place of residence a few times¹⁰⁶ before they settled in

¹⁰¹ See, for example, Voyereno-topograficheskaya karta Yekaterinoslavskoy gubernii, list 27, ryad 13.

¹⁰² O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

¹⁰³ T.L. Kuzyk, *Vidomist' pro zalinijni poselennya vid 17 sichnya 1762 r. yak dzherelo do istoriyi Starosamarskoyi sotni Poltavs'kogo polku*, „Sicheslavs'kyj almanah” 2006, t. 2, p. 29.

¹⁰⁴ *Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi...*, t. 3, pp. 333–337.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 303–305.

¹⁰⁶ For example, the re-settler from the Lubensky Cossack regiment, Mykyta Bezkrorny (a future otaman of *sloboda* Brygadyrivka, see T.L. Kuzyk, *Perekhid...*, p. 418), before he settled in June 1741 on the land of Apachynin by the wilderness of Trytuzne (from where the brigadier resettled his subjects in 1742 to the lands just bought by him in the vicinity of Romanivs'kyi Re-

a specific *sloboda* for a longer period – considering the conditions in the area of the Zaporizhian Host – of 10–20 years. Research on the history of settlements¹⁰⁷, tracing realistic migration rates in the lands of the Zaporizhian Host, and interpretation of these rates in the context of studies on the imperial impact on people at the local level, obviously faces problem of tremendously incomplete source base, which makes it impossible to frontally examine the structure of population together with its changes over time. However, the sources of the census¹⁰⁸, which

doubt, wilderness of Chorni Lozy, on the foundations of which the above-mentioned *sloboda* was built), he had lived with his family in Zaporizhia and in the vicinity of Birkut Fortification. A migrant from Uman', Matviy Kucus, had gone a similar way before settling down in the settlement of Trytuzne. A Cossack from the town of Keleberda of the Poltava Regiment, Klym Procenko, had lived in the Zaporizhian *sloboda* of Kamyanka before being settled by the Chorni Lozy in May 1742; already mentioned Andriy Gordychenko had lived for some time "in Zaporizhia" before he settled in Somivka (Sokil'ska) in 1739; a Cossack from Poltava, Klym Poltavsky, had managed to live not only in Zaporizhia, but he had also returned to the Hetmanate, to Perevolochna, and then he "came" to Sokil's'kyy Redoubt in 1742. In a short period of time, other residents of Brygadyrivka resettled over even greater distances, for example, for "a Cossack, Myron Kravets, and a migrated man from the right-bank Ukraine, Dmytro Sologubienko, the 4–10 year long stay in Trytuzne was a second return to the territory of Zaporizhia – it had been preceded by his return to the Right-bank Ukraine (Sologubienko) for a few years and a few year stay in the town Kyszen'ka of the Poltava Cossack Regiment" (see D.I. Evarnitskiy, *op. cit.*, pp. 1713–1714). Already mentioned Klym Protsenko did not stay for long in the *sloboda* of Danylivka: already in August 1744, he is mentioned as a resident of Zaporizhian town New Kodak (*Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi...*, t. 1, p. 219). The above-mentioned examples of mobility could be explained with the efforts of Brigadier Apachynin which were directed towards establishing private *slobodas* on the lands bought by him, which is proven by the fact of entrusting Klym Poltavsky with transactions of purchasing arable lands bought by Apachynin (*ibidem*, p. 1712). However, similar processes were characteristic also for other settlements and not only for private *slobodas* of the local Russian commanders.

¹⁰⁷ An exemplary work on this topic is a doctoral thesis by Petro Boyko (*Dzherela istoriyi formuvannya naseleння Oleksandriivs'kogo povitu ostannoyi chverti XVIII – pochatku XIX stolit'ya*, Kyiv 2016 [Dysertaciya na zbuttya naukovogo stupenya kandydata istorichnyh nauk]).

¹⁰⁸ See, for example, a) the registry of people settled by Brigadier Apachynin in the wilderness of Chorni Lozy and by the Sokil's'kyy Redoubt from 12 September 1742 (D.I. Evarnitskiy, *op. cit.*, pp. 1713–1714); b) registry of the Zaporizhian migrant people from the Hetmanate, right-bank Ukraine and Slobozhanshchyna, who lived in the Zaporizhian *slobodas* of 1756 (*Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi...*, t. 3, pp. 287–289, 291–292); c) confessional censuses of Pokrovska Orthodox church of the village of Danylivka (Brygadyrivka) in 1766 (CSHAUK, found 127, inv. 1017, file 9, fol. 104–118b) and 1769 (CSHAUK, found 990, inv. 1, file 734, fol. 114–120b); d) registry of married Cossacks who came to the village of Kurylivka and Chaplinka from Sokil's'ka and Brygadyrivka in 1768 (CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 52, fol. 31), a registry of married Cossacks who were living together with peasants, and married Cossacks who live in the territory of *palanka* from 1769 (CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 279, fol. 172b, 285b), registries of owners of inns and stalls in the territory of the Samarian *palanka* in 1771–1772 (CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 306, fol. 29–29b, 52); e) registry of Cossacks from the Samara District (*uyezd*) who took part in the Russo-Turkish War in 1768–1774, from 5 February 1776 (RNAHD, found 16, inv. 1, file 747, part. 1, fol. 448–449b).

are at the researcher's disposal, allow to present a few observations (on the basis of the "re-redoubt" *slobodas* of Brygadyrivka, Sokil'ska and Revunivka).

Censuses carried out by Kosh¹⁰⁹ and the Hetmanate administration in 1756¹¹⁰ recorded *sotnie* of the displaced people, who settled in the off-the-line settlements beyond the Orel River and the Zaporizhian *slobodas* in the period from the end of the 1730s to the beginning of the 1740. On the other hand, as of mid-1740s, it was a known fact that depopulation of settlements "by the fortresses", controlled by the Hetmanate and Russian authority, was in favour of Zaporizhia (depopulated settlements included those by the Ust-Samara, Kamyanka, and Nienasytets' fortifications, which has already been mentioned above). Old Samara was an exception as the number of population was rising. However, this did not mean the lack of outflow of people from this town to the Zaporizhian *slobodas* – it existed and was the basic direction of migration¹¹¹ – but as can be supposed, it was nullified by the influx of new incomers from the Hetmanate. On the other hand, the number of people in Old Samara started to decline rapidly from the beginning of the 1750s (and in 1761).

Regardless of subordinating Old Samara to the Hetmanate administration (through the Old Samara *sotnia*), the impact of the Russian factor over the town is beyond any doubts. This is particularly proven by the fact of sending back the "unlawfully settled" in the Zaporizhian steppe incomers, who came from Old Samara, to their previous place of residence by Captain Ulianin in 1742 and an attempt of turning them back with the help of an especially delegated unit of Ensign Svierchkov in 1747. The influence of the Russian strategies to keep in place the population of the *slobodas* of Danylivka (Brygadyrivka) and Sokil'ska (Sokil'ska Redoubt, Somivka) near the Russian redoubts – which as of the first half of the 1740s were private *slobodas* of Brigadier Danylo Apachynin – becomes even more evident.

However, the stages of influx of the new population and depopulation of the settlements in the territory of the Zaporizhian Host in the period of New Sich testify to a key political influence of Zaporizhian Sich (change in the notion of colonising the Zaporizhian lands) and not of the Russian fortresses and Russian commanders over the processes of development and fall of the populated places. The notion of colonising the Zaporizhian lands was for the first time recorded in 1756 in a letter addressed to the Koshovyi Otaman, Grygoriy Lantuch, by the Zaporizhian delegation of the elders which included Petro Kalnyshevs'kyy, Danylo Gladky and Ivan Chuguyevets' who were in Saint Petersburg. The elders advised to colonise the empty territories in the Zaporizhian lands because there

¹⁰⁹ See, for example, *Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi...*, t. 3, pp. 211–265, 281–292.

¹¹⁰ T.L. Kuzyk, *Vidomist' pro zalinijni poselennya...*, p. 29; CSHAUK, found 51, inv. 3, file 13796, fol. 53–123.

¹¹¹ T.L. Kuzyk, *Vidomist' pro zalinijni poselennya...*, p. 34.

were voices coming from the imperial court that there was a lot of empty land in Zaporizhia¹¹². A perfect proof for the change in the Kosh's policy towards the newcomers from the Hetmanate was a ban issued for *sotnik* Jareskivs'koyi *sotini* from the Myrhorod Regiment, Alexander Potapienko, who came to New Kodak in order to search for newcomers from his *sotnia* in order to turn them back to their previous place of residence (summer 1756)¹¹³. In relation to the changes in the politics of Zaporizhia towards the agricultural colonisation, one should mention one of the major reasons for liquidating Zaporizhian Sich included in the manifesto by Catherine II – "Zaporizhians carried out their own economy, crops, which liquidated their dependence from our throne"¹¹⁴. While anticipating the facts regarding the results of this study, it should be noted that this kind of wording used in the imperial decree is an excellent proof of the success of Zaporizhia's internal affairs in regard to colonisation.

A sudden decrease in the number of settlements placed next to fortifications already at the beginning of the 1740s and then a decline in the number of population in Old Samara at the beginning of the 1750s – with the simultaneous increase in the number of newcomers from Ukraine in typically Zaporizhian towns and *slobodas* (firstly, we are talking about stronghold centres and then also about *slobodas* in the vicinity of the *palankas* of Samara and Kodak) – provides foundations for talking about a change in the direction of displacement streams towards populated points subordinated to Zaporizhia. Additionally, one should also add the transition under the Zaporizhian jurisdiction of Brygadyrivka, Revunivka, and Sokil'ska, which made them once again attractive for people displaced from Ukraine.

Therefore, comparing the censuses of residents of the Zaporizhian settlements available to the researcher¹¹⁵, we can introduce a hypothesis regarding a specific stabilisation of migration streams of population between various settlements in Zaporizhia (without taking into account the off-line ones) – i.e. the number of population of each, separately examined *sloboda* did not change significantly and people did not frequently travel over long distances (as was the case with the first displaced people of Danylivka). In the period from the 1750s to the end of the 1760s, the composition of population was changing much more slowly than in 1739–1740 when we observe not only an increase in the number of population

¹¹² T.L. Kuzyk, *Perekhid...*, p. 414.

¹¹³ O.A. Repan, V.S. Starostin, O.V. Harlan, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

¹¹⁴ V.O. Golobucky, *Zaporoz'ke kozatstvo*, Kyiv 1995, p. 536.

¹¹⁵ It should be remembered that in the area in question – territory of Zaporizhia – people often changed their surnames. A person could change his surname (on the basis of which we recognise him in the documents) a few times in his lifetime, depending for instance on his/her current profession (if the surname was taking its beginning from the name of crafts) or depending on life circumstances, etc. (O.D. Sukhomlyn, *Pohodzhennya ta zanyattya naseleennya mistechka Samarchyka u 1750-ti rr. za dokumentamy Arhivu Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi*, „Prydniprov'ya: istoriko-krajeznavchi doslidzhennya” 2011, t. 9, p. 34, 36, 37).

in particular points of colonization, but we also record a specific “core” of the local residents who lived in one *sloboda* for a relatively long time. The confessional census from 1766 in particular recorded at least 11 surnames included in the census from 1756 in Brygadyrivka and 9 in *sloboda* Sokil’ska; some of the same surnames also appear in the census of married Cossacks and Cossacks who were owners of inns in 1768–1772. And the census of married Cossacks of the Samara District (*uyezd*) from 1776 records 5 surnames in each of these villages from the census of 1756. In the meantime, as of 1756, there is only one family – of Mykyta Bezkrivny – left from amongst all those settled by Brigadier Apachynin in 1742 in the *sloboda* of Danylivka. The observed stabilisation of the number of people in the Zaporizhian *slobodas* is a vivid example of implementing the internal policy of Kosh in the area of colonising the Zaporizhian lands, expressed by the Zaporizhian elites in 1756.

Together with an increase of time spent in a *sloboda* by its permanent residents we observe a process in which the married Cossacks created their own places for waiting out the winter in the vicinity of this *sloboda*¹¹⁶, as well as examples of migration to the near-by, neighbouring *slobodas*¹¹⁷.

The period of the “core’s” stability lasted towards the end of the 1760s and the beginning of the 1770s in the case of Sokolska and Brygadirovka when some of the residents of these *slobodas* moved to the village of Kurylivka¹¹⁸ and Chaplinka, a recently established Protovczanska *palanka*, as well as to the village of Kamyanka of the Samara’s *palanka*. However, it is doubtful that these changes were only a direct result of events of the war and political nature (building new strongholds and the Kosh’s aim to their fast colonisation), but they were caused by natural factors – significant flooding of Brygadyrivka, Kurylivka¹¹⁹ and most certainly Sokil’s’ka were observed in those years.

¹¹⁶ For instance, a married Cossack, A. Mandryka, was recorded in Sokil’s’ka in 1756; as of 1761, he already had his winter quarter, but he was still assigned to the *sloboda* (CSHAUK, found 51, inv. 3, file 9333, fol. 433b).

¹¹⁷ For instance, a peasant, Samiyo Zaredutny, was recorded in Sokil’s’ka in 1763 (O.D. Sukhomlyn, *Konflikty...*, p. 39); as of 1770, he was already a resident of the village of Kamianka of the Samara’s *palanka* (CSHAUK, found 229, inv. 1, file 279, fol. 285b, 2), and he is recorded already as a married Cossack in the census of the Samara District (*uyezd*) in 1776 (RNAHD, found 16, inv. 1, file 747, part 1, fol. 448). Lukiyan Siroklan, a peasant (and later – a married Cossack), also moved from Kamyanka to Brygadyrivka between 1769 and 1776 (*ibidem*). However, at the same time, Petro Shtovchan (Shtovhanyenko), known in 1763 as a resident of Sokil’ska (O.D. Sukhomlyn, *Konflikty...*, p. 39), in 1776 was recorded as a Cossack from Brygadyrivka (RNAHD, found 16, inv. 1, file 747, part 1, fol. 448).

¹¹⁸ At present, a village of Kurylivka, in Petrykivka District in Dnipropetrovsk Oblast.

¹¹⁹ F. Makarevskiy, *Materialy dlya istoriko-statisticheskogo opisaniya Ekaterinoslavskoy ieparhii. Tserkvi i prikhody proshedshago XVIII stoletiya*, Dnipropetrovs’k 2000, p. 433, 436.

CONCLUSIONS

The Russian fortifications, redoubts in particular, did not play a significant role in the process of populating the territories of the Zaporizhia Host (the interfluvium between the Orel and Samara Rivers) and the national and private Russian colonising policy did not have a long-term impact on the creation and development of a network of colonising points. People did not stay for a long time in the vicinity of the Russian fortresses for a few reasons, one of which was uselessness of these places to living of rural population. However, a much more significant factor was the fact that the Hetmanate administration made attempts to restore the displaced population (although in a different place) with their previous status – Cossacks and peasants of the Hetmanate by creating the *sotnia* of Old Samara. Attempts made by the Russian administration – and associated with accumulating population near fortresses (in order to guarantee the garrisons' needs) – were also unsuccessful. Private initiatives, aimed at populating small, private *slobodas* by the Russian officers, also did not bring the expected results. Although at this stage we can evaluate the fate of only two of them – Sokil's'ka and Brygadyrivka – it seems obvious that there are no reflection on their location as well as exploitation by their owners, absent in the Zaporizhian *slobodas*. A key factor supporting the colonisation of the Zaporizhia Host's lands – at the cost of the displaced people from the settlements next to the Russian fortresses – was a change in the concept of populating Zaporizhia, present in the circles of the Cossack (Zaporizhian) elites in the mid-1750s. Due to the change of views on the problem of migration and settlement of rural population coming from the Hetmanate, according to the data from the 1750s and 1770s, it is possible to observe not only a quick increase of the general number of population in Zaporizhia but also stability in the personal composition of population because the migration streams between the points of populating diminished significantly. It was the very internal policy of the Zaporizhia Host and not the Russian fortresses which favoured the formation and creation of a net of settlements of a rural nature in the territories of the Zaporizhia Host.

The statements made above are also confirmed by the works of Russian historians on the topic of fortresses which were a part of the Moscow's "defensive line" (*zasiachnaia cherta*) in the 17th century and in their own time played a role of outposts of the State of Moscow in the southern direction (at present, these are the territories in the Belgorod and Kursk Oblasts of the Russian Federation). In the first half of the 17th century, colonisation in these two towns moved at a much slower pace than in the territories of Left-bank Ukraine. As emphasised by Aleksei Novosielskiy and Pavel Smirnov, until the mid-1630s, the military nature of these fortified points and "rigorous enforcement of serfdom laws in Russia" held back rare influxes of people from Moscow to the Steppe. And the appearance by the fortresses of the "defensive lines" of a small number of "free" people did not

mean that these towns situated around the fortresses were to be transferred into a colonised region¹²⁰. This fact is also confirmed by the failure of the Russian military colonisation in the border zones on the Great Steppe Border of Europe throughout various historical periods.

REFERENCES

Archival sources

- Institute of Manuscripts of the National Library of Ukraine named after V. Vernadsky, found 1, file 54335.
- The Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv (CSHAUK): found 51, inv. 3, file 5703, 7016, 9333, 13796; found 59, inv. 1, file 781, 785, 1012, 1377; found 127, inv. 1017, file 9; found 229, inv. 1, file 29, 52, 238, 279, 306; found 269, inv. 1, file 1803; found 755, inv. 1, file 3; found 990, inv. 1, file 734.
- The Russian National Archives of Historical Documents, found 16, inv. 1, file 747, part 1.

Published sources

- Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi. Korpus dokumentiv 1734–1775*, t. 1, Kyiv 1998.
- Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi. Korpus dokumentiv 1734–1775*, t. 2, Kyiv 2000.
- Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi. Korpus dokumentiv 1734–1775*, t. 3, Kyiv 2003.
- Arhiv Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi. Korpus dokumentiv 1734–1775*, t. 4, Kyiv 2006.
- Dzherela z istoriyi Pivdennoyi Ukrayiny*, t. 10: *Opysy Stepovoyi Ukrayiny ostannoyi chverti XVIII – pochatku XIX stolittya*, red. A. Boyko, Zaporizhzhya 2009.
- Evarnitskiy D.I., *Istochniki dlya istorii zaporozhskih kozakov*, t. 2, Vladimir 1903.

Map sources

- Plan goroda Dnepropetrovska i yego blizhajshih okrestnostej, 1929–1932. Mashtab 1:10 000.
- Voyenno-topograficheskaya karta Yekaterinoslavskoy gubernii, list 27, ryad 13.

Literature

- Apanovych O.M., *Zbroyni syly Ukrayiny pershoji polovyny XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1969.
- Bayov A.K., *Russkaya armiya v carstvovanie imperatricy Anny Ioannovny. Vojna Rossii s Turciej v 1736–1739 gg. Kampaniya 1739 goda*, Sankt-Peterburg 1909.
- Bayov A.K., *Russkaya armiya v carstvovanie imperatricy Anny Ioannovny. Vojna Rossii s Turciej v 1736–1739 gg. Pervye tri goda vojny*, Sankt-Peterburg 1909.
- Boyko P.A., *Dzherela istoriyi formuvannya naselennya Oleksandrivs'kogo povitu ostannoyi chverti XVIII – pochatku XIX stolittya*, Kyiv 2016 (Dysertaciya na zdobuttya naukowego stupenya kandydata istorichnyh nauk).
- Brekhunenko V.A., *Skhidna brama Yevropy. Kozats'ka Ukrayina v seredyni XVII–XVIII st.*, Kyiv 2014.
- Davies B.L., *The Russo-Turkish War, 1768–1774: Catherine II and the Ottoman Empire*, London 2015.
- Gistsova L.Z., *Spovidna knyha Starokodats'koyi zaporoz'koyi hrestovoyi namistiyyi yak dzherelo do vyvchennya istoriyi poselen Volnostej viyskovykh*, „Sicheslavs'kyj almanah” 2006, t. 2.

¹²⁰ A.A. Novoselskiy, *Bor'ba Moskovskogo gosudarstva s tatarami v pervoj polovine XVII veka*, Moskva–Leningrad 1946, pp. 161–166; P. Smirnov, *Goroda Moskovskogo gosudarstva v pervoj polovine XVII veka*, t. 1, ch. 2, Kyiv 1917, p. 50.

- Grybovsky V.V., *Petro Kalnyshevs'kyi u vymiri polityky ta povsiakdennosti*, „Kozats'ka spadshchyna: almanah Instytutu suspil'nykh doslidzhen” 2006, t. 3.
- Gurzhii O.I., *Polityko-administratyvne j terytorial'ne reformuvannya Getmanshyny u XVIII st.: prychny, perebig, naslidky*, Kyiv 2015.
- Holobutsky V.O., *Zaporiz'ka Sich v ostanni chasy svoho isnuvannya*, Kyiv 1961.
- Holobutsky V.O., *Zaporoz'ke kozatstvo*, Kyiv 1995.
- Kuzyk T.L., *Perekhid zhyteliv slobody Danylivky u pidanstvo Viys'ka Zaporoz'kogo Nizovogo*, „Ukrayins'kyi arheografichnyy shchorichnyk” 2007, t. 12.
- Kuzyk T.L., *Vidomist' pro zalinijni poselennya vid 17 sichnya 1762 r. yak dzherelo do istoriyi Starosamarskoyi sotni Poltavs'kogo polku*, „Sichslavs'kyj almanah” 2006, t. 2.
- Laskovskiy F.F., *Karty, plany i chertezhi k 3-j chasti Materialov dlya istorii inzhenernago iskusstva v Rossii*, Sankt-Peterburg 1866.
- Laskovskiy F.F., *Materialy dlya istorii inzhenernago iskusstva v Rossii*, ch. 3, Sankt-Peterburg 1865.
- Makarevskiy F., *Materialy dlya istoriko-statisticheskogo opisaniya Ekaterinoslavskoy ieparhii. Tserkvi i prikholody proshedshago XVIII stoletiya*, Dnipropetrovs'k 2000.
- Malov O.V., Veklenko V.O., Veklenko A.V., *Kartografichni dzhherela do istoriyi Bogorodyckoyi fortetsi-Starosamarskogo retranshementu*, „Frontyry mista: istoriko-kulturologichnyy almanah” 2012, t. 1.
- Marina Z.P., Filimonov D.G., *Do pitannya pro misceznahodzhennya slobody ta perevoziv bilya Ust-Samarskogo retranshementu (za pysemnymi ta arheologichnymi danymi)*, „Muzeynyj visnyk” 2009, t. 9.
- Mil'chev V.I., Knyaz'kov Yu.P., *Proekt reformuvannya ustroyu Zaporozhzhya general-majora Karla Shtofelna (1765 r.)*, „Zapysky naukovo-doslidnoyi laboratoriyi istoriyi Pivdennoyi Ukrainy Zaporiz'kogo derzhavnogo universytetu” 2003, t. 7.
- Moldavsky R.L., *Nova Dniprovskaya liniya ukriplen' (1770–1791 rr.)*, Zaporozhzhya 2007.
- Novoselskiy A.A., *Bor'ba Moskovskogo gosudarstva s tatarami v pervoj polovine XVII veka*, Moskva–Leningrad 1946.
- Petro Kalnyshevs'kyi ta yogo doba. Dokumenty ta materialy*, red. V. Grybovsky, V. Milchev, I. Syniak, Kyiv 2009.
- Podhorodecki L., *Sicz Zaporoska*, Warszawa 1970.
- Repan O.A., *Komisyyi u Starosamars'komu retranshementi yak skladova vzayemodiya rosiys'kykh viys'kovykh ta Kosha (1750–1760 rr.)*, „Naddniproys'ka Ukraina: istorichni protsesy, podiyyi, postati” 2012, t. 10.
- Repan O.A., *Konfliktna vzayemodiya zalohy Lots-kam"yans'koho retranshementu z mistsevym naseleнням u 1750–1760-kyh rr.*, „Prydniprovs'ka: istoriko-krajeznavchi doslidzhennya” 2016, t. 14.
- Repan O.A., *Vzayemnyy harnizonu Starosamars'koho retranshementu z mistsevym naseleнням: koni ta navkolo nykh*, [in:] *Zaporoz'ka Sich i ukrayins'ke kozatstvo*, red. V.V. Kryvosheya, Kyiv 2013.
- Repan O.A., Starostin V.S., Harlan O.V., *Palimpsest. Korinnya mista: poselennya XVI–XVIII st. v istoriyi Dnipropetrovs'ka*, Kyiv 2008.
- Romanova O.O., *Spovidal'ni knygy Kyivs'koyi mytropoliyi XVIII st. yak zasib kontrolyu za morallyu parafiyam*, „Ukrayins'kyj istorichnyy zhurnal” 2008, t. 4.
- Rostworowski E., *Polska w ukladzie sil politycznych Europy XVIII wieku*, [in:] *Polska w epoce Oświecenia. Państwo – społeczeństwo – kultura*, red. B. Leśnodorski, Warszawa 1971.
- Ryabinin-Sklyarevskyy O.O., *Zaporoz'ki zakoloty ta keruyucha verstva Kosha XVIII st.*, [in:] *A.A. Ryabinin-Sklyarevskyy. Materialy k biografii*, red. G.L. Malinova, I.V. Sapozhnikov, Odessa 2000.
- Sakalo O., *Dzherela istorichnoyi demografii: spovidnyj rozpys*, „Naukovi zapysky. Zbirnyk prac molodykh vchenyh ta aspirantiv” 2009, t. 19.

- Shvyd'ko G.K., *Ostanni sprobny zaporozhstiv vidstoyaty svoiy volnosti*, „Pivdenna Ukrayina XVIII–XIX st.: Zapiski naukovo-doslidnoyi laboratorii istoriyi Pivdennoyi Ukrayiny Zaporiz'kogo derzhavnogo universytetu” 1996, t. 2.
- Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, t. 14, Warszawa 1880–1914.
- Smirnov P., *Goroda Moskovskogo gosudarstva v pervoy polovine XVII veka*, t. 1, ch. 2, Kyiv 1917.
- Starostin V.S., *Stolytsya Shidnogo Zaporozhzhya*, 112, „Frontyry mista: istoriko-kulturologichnyy almanah” 2013, t. 3.
- Sukhomlyn O.D., *Konflikty yak element povsyakdennoyi vzayemodiyi naseleennyi slobody Sokils'koyi ta rosyy's'kyh viyskovykh (1750–1760-ti rr.)*, „Istoriya i kultura Prydniprov'ya: nevidomi ta malovidomi storinky” 2013, t. 10.
- Sukhomlyn O.D., *Pohodzhennya ta zanyattya naseleennyi mistechka Samarchyka u 1750-ti rr. za dokumentamy Arhivu Kosha Novoyi Zaporoz'koyi Sichi*, „Prydniprov'ya: istoriko-krayeznavchi doslidzhennya” 2011, t. 9.
- Sukhomlyn O.D., *Problemy lokalizatsiyi ta funkcionuvannya redutiv XVIII st. u mezhyrichchi Oreli ta Samary*, „Prydniprov'ya: istoriko-krayeznavchi doslidzhennya” 2012/2013, t. 11.
- Zamura O., *Velykyi shalenets. Smert' ta smertnist' u Getmanshyni XVIII st.*, Kyiv 2014.

STRESZCZENIE

Bazując na podejściu mikrohistorycznym, rozpatrzono ogólny przebieg zasiedlania regionu i proces tworzenia *slobód* przy rosyjskich twierdzach oraz wysiłki kolonizacyjne (państwowe, prywatne) podejmowane przez administrację rosyjską. Analiza dokumentów dotyczących spisu ludności świadczy o zasadniczym wpływie właśnie elity zaporoskiej, a nie rosyjskich twierdz na proces zasiedlania Zaporozża w latach 40. i 60. XVIII w. Próby opanowania *slobód* przy twierdzach przez rosyjską administrację oraz próby rozszerzenia władzy na poddanych zaporoskich się nie powiodły.

Słowa kluczowe: zaporoski gospodarz; Ukraina Południowa; *sloboda*; kolonizacja; spis wynaniowy; rosyjskie twierdze