



Міністерство освіти і науки України
Ministry of Education, Science of Ukraine

Херсонський державний університет
Kherson State University
(м. Івано-Франківськ)

ПІВДЕННИЙ АРХІВ
SOUTH ARCHIVE

(історичні науки)
(Historical Sciences)

Випуск — **LIII**
Issue



Видавничий дім
«Гельветика»
2026

Реєстрація в Національній раді України з питань телебачення і радіомовлення: Рішення № 2944 від 24.10.2024 (Ідентифікатор медіа R30-05626).

Суб'єкт у сфері друкованих медіа – Херсонський державний університет (вул. Університетська, 27, м. Херсон, 73000, e-mail: office@ksu.ks.ua. Тел.: +38 096 310 26 36).

Мови розповсюдження: українська, англійська, польська, німецька. Включено до категорії «Б» Переліку наукових фахових видань України зі спеціальності В9 «Історія та археологія» на підставі Наказу Міністерства освіти і науки України № 1017 від 27 вересня 2021 року (додаток 3).

Журнал включено до наукометричної бази даних Index Copernicus (Республіка Польща)

Затверджено відповідно до рішення вченої ради Херсонського державного університету (протокол від 23.03.2026 р. № 12)

ГОЛОВНИЙ РЕДАКТОР:

Водотика Сергій Григорович – доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання Херсонський державний університет, Україна.

ЗАСТУПНИК ГОЛОВНОГО РЕДАКТОРА:

Черемісін Олександр Вікторович – доктор історичних наук, професор, професор кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання Херсонський державний університет, Україна.

ВІДПОВІДАЛЬНИЙ СЕКРЕТАР:

Кузовова Наталя Миколаївна – кандидат історичних наук, доцент, завідувач кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання Херсонський державний університет, Україна.

ТЕХНІЧНИЙ СЕКРЕТАР:

Діба Людмила Миколаївна – аспірантка кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання, Херсонський державний університет, Україна.

ЧЛЕНИ РЕДАКЦІЙНОЇ КОЛЕГІЇ:

Дрозд Роман Михайлович – доктор історичних наук, професор, Почесний професор Херсонського державного університету, професор Інституту історії, Академія Поморська в Слупську, Польща; Робак Ігор Юрійович – доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри суспільних наук, Харківський національний медичний університет, Україна;

Рижєва Надія Олександрівна – доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри історії Навчально-наукового педагогічного інституту імені В. О. Сухомлинського, Національний університет кораблебудування імені адмірала Макарова, Україна;

Гречко Денис Сергійович – доктор історичних наук, професор, старший науковий співробітник відділу археології раннього залізного віку, Інститут археології НАН України, Україна;

Котлярчук Андрій – доктор історичних наук, доцент, старший науковий співробітник Інституту сучасної історії Школи історичних та сучасних студій, Університет Седертерна (Стокгольм), Швеція;

Пархоменко Владислав Анатолійович – доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри історії, Чорноморський національний університет імені Петра Могили, Україна;

Михайленко Галина Миколаївна – кандидат історичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання, Херсонський державний університет, Україна;

Макієнко Олексій Анатолійович – кандидат історичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри готельно-ресторанного та туристичного бізнесу, Херсонський державний університет, Україна;

Батенко Ганна Вячеславівна – кандидат історичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання, Херсонський державний університет, Україна;

Бойков Олег Юрійович – кандидат історичних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри історії, археології та методики викладання, Херсонський державний університет, Україна.

Офіційний сайт видання: <http://pahs.journal.kspu.edu>

Південний архів (історичні науки) : Збірник наукових праць.

Випуск LIII. – Івано-Франківськ : ХДУ, 2026. – 48 с.

© ХДУ, 2026

Registered by the National Council of Television and Radio Broadcasting of Ukraine: Decision No. 2944 as of 24.10.2024 (Media ID: R30-05626).

Media entity – Kherson State University (Universytetska str., 27, Kherson, 73000, e-mail: office@ksu.ks.ua. Tel: +38 096 310 26 36).

Languages: Ukrainian, English, Polish, German.

Included in category “B” of the List of scientific professional publications of Ukraine in specialty B9 “History and Archeology” on the basis of the Order of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine № 1017 from September 27, 2021 (Annex 3).

The journal is included in scientometric database Index Copernicus (the Republic of Poland)

Approved by the Decision of Academic Council of Kherson State University (protocol № 12, 23.03.2026)

EDITOR DIRECTOR:

Vodotyka Serhii Hryhorovych – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Professor at the Department of History, Archeology and Teaching Methods, Kherson State University, Ukraine.

DEPUTY CHIEF EDITOR:

Cheremisin Oleksandr Viktorovych – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Professor at the Department of History, Archeology and Teaching Methods, Kherson State University, Ukraine.

ASSISTANT EDITOR:

Kuzovova Natalia Mykolaivna – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of History, Archeology and Teaching Methods, Kherson State University, Ukraine.

TECHNICAL SECRETARY:

Dyba Liudmyla Mykolaivna – Postgraduate Student at the Department of History, Archeology and Teaching Methods, Kherson State University, Ukraine.

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS:

Drozdz Roman Mykhailovych – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Honored Professor of Kherson State University, Professor at the Institute of History, Pomeranian Academy in Slupsk, Poland;

Robak Ihor Yuriiovych – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Department of Social Sciences, Kharkiv National Medical University, Ukraine;

Ryzheva Nadiia Oleksandrivna – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Head of the Department of History, V. O. Sukhomlynskyi Educational and Scientific Pedagogical Institute, Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding, Ukraine;

Hrechko Denys Serhiiovych – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor, Senior Research Associate at the Department of Archeology of the Early Iron Age, Institute of Archeology of the NAS of Ukraine;

Kotliarchuk Andrii – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Senior Research Associate at the Institute of Contemporary History of the School of Historical and Modern Studies, Södertörn University (Stockholm), Sweden;

Parkhomenko Vladyslav Anatoliiovych – Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor at the Department of History, Petro Mohyla Black Sea National University, Ukraine;

Mykhailenko Halyna Mykolaivna – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer at the Department of History, Archeology and Teaching Methods, Kherson State University, Ukraine;

Makiienko Oleksii Anatoliiovych – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer at the Department of Hotel, Restaurant and Tourism Business, Kherson State University, Ukraine;

Batenko Hanna Viacheslavivna – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer at the Department of History, Archeology and Teaching Methods, Kherson State University, Ukraine;

Boikov Oleh Yuriiovych – Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer at the Department of History, Archeology and Teaching Methods, Kherson State University, Ukraine.

Official website of edition: <http://pahs.journal.kspu.edu>

South Archive (Historical Sciences): Collected papers. Issue LIII. –

Ivano-Frankivsk : Kherson State University, 2026. – 48 p.

© KSU, 2026

ЗМІСТ

Козловський С. О. ВІЙСЬКО КРИМСЬКОГО ХАНСТВА У ВОЄННИХ КАМΠΑНИЯХ ПРОТИ МОЛДОВСЬКОГО КНЯЗІВСТВА (1484–1538 РР.)	5
Леміш Н. О. ПОЛКОВО-СОТЕННІ ОБЛІКОВО-СТАТИСНИЧНІ ДОКУМЕНТИ В СИСТЕМІ ДІЛОВОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ ГЕТЬМАНЩИНИ	18
Паска Б. В. БОРОТЬБА КДБ ПРОТИ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ШІСТДЕСЯТНИКІВ У ПЕРШІЙ ПОЛОВИНІ 1960-Х РР.	26
Рижева Н. О. ІСТОРИЧНЕ ЗБРОЄЗНАВСТВО В СИСТЕМІ ПІДГОТОВКИ ВЧИТЕЛІВ ІСТОРІЇ В УКРАЇНІ	33
Скрипник Д. А. МІСЬКА ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ХЕРСОНА НА РУБЕЖІ ХІХ–ХХ СТ: ЕЛЕКТРОТРАНСПОРТ ЯК МЕХАНІЗМ УРБАНІСТИЧНОЇ МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЇ	40

CONTENTS

Kozlovskiy S. O. THE ARMY OF THE CRIMEAN KHANATE IN THE MILITARY CAMPAIGNS AGAINST THE MOLDOVAN PRINCIPALITY (1484–1538).....	5
Lemish N. O. REGIMENTAL AND COMPANY-LEVEL ACCOUNTING AND STATISTICAL DOCUMENTS IN THE SYSTEM OF OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION OF THE HETMANATE	18
Paska B. V. THE KGB’S STRUGGLE AGAINST THE UKRAINIAN SIXTIES IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 1960S	26
Ryzheva N. O. HISTORICAL WEAPONS SCIENCE IN THE SYSTEM OF TRAINING HISTORY TEACHERS IN UKRAINE.....	33
Skrypnyk D. A. URBAN TRANSFORMATION OF KHERSON AT THE TURN OF THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES: ELECTRIC TRANSPORT AS A MECHANISM OF URBAN MODERNIZATION.....	40

UDC 94:[355.12:355.01(477.75:478)“1484/1538”]
DOI https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2026-53-1

THE ARMY OF THE CRIMEAN KHANATE IN THE MILITARY CAMPAIGNS AGAINST THE MOLDOVAN PRINCIPALITY (1484–1538)

Kozlovskiy Serhii Orlanovych,
*Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of History
of Middle Ages and Byzantine Studies
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
serg.kozlovskyy@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0002-4590-2433*

The article examines the features of the military campaigns of the Crimean Khanate, as an ally of the Ottoman Empire, against the Moldavian Principality during 1484-1538, analyzes the number, armament and tactics of the Crimeans, the process of Moldova's transformation into a vassal state of the Porte is shown.

The purpose of the study is a comprehensive analysis of the participation of the Crimean Khanate's army in hostilities against Moldova in 1484-1538.

The methodological basis of the article is the general scientific principles of historicism, objectivity and systematicity. The historical-genetic method allows us to trace changes in political relations between the Porte, the Crimean Khanate and Moldova. The historical-comparative method allows us to compare the army of the Moldavian Principality, the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire, primarily their numerical composition, tactics and features of military art.

Scientific novelty. The article shows the significant role of the Crimean Tatars in the conquest of Moldova by the Ottoman Empire. A large array of contemporary narrative sources, works of Romanian, Turkish and Ukrainian researchers are used. The reports of the contemporary chronicles and annals about the battles of 1518 and 1538 are critically examined – mainly about the number of participants, the course and consequences. It is proven that the actions of the Crimeans weakened the ability of Moldova to resist the Turks, dealt a powerful blow to the mobilization capabilities of the principality, and also made a significant contribution to the tactical and field reconnaissance of the Ottomans. It is traced that Moldova was never able to find effective allies among other states, and Poland, due to the conflict over Pokuttya, acted as a situational ally of the Porte, in particular in the campaign of 1538.

Conclusions. The Turkish sultans began to involve the Tatars for raids on the Moldavian territories from the second half of the 15th century, as an instrument of pressure, intimidation and punishment. The Tatar raid of 1518 ended in failure for them, as the Moldavian army, thanks to night maneuvers, was able to defeat the Crimean camp and pursued the enemy. Relations between Moldova and the Porte significantly worsened during the reign of the lord Petru Rareș. It is proven that the military campaign of the Porte in 1538 had a number of reasons, primarily due to the actions of the Moldavian lord P. Rareș, strategic goals and the need to obtain a bridgehead for further campaigns against European states. It is concluded that the principality in 1538 was unable to fully mobilize the army due to the actions of the Tatars and the resistance of the Moldavian elite (boyars), the lord was unable to give the enemy a decisive battle in a pre-selected place. The Crimean Khanate, thanks to the use of successful tactics and maneuvers, actively contributed to the capture of Moldova by the Ottomans. Due to their high mobility, the Crimeans were engaged in tactical reconnaissance on the battlefield, carried out diversionary maneuvers, and were recruited by the Ottomans to collect fodder and supplies on the territory of Moldova.

Keywords: Crimean Khanate, army, military art, Late Middle Ages, battles, tactics, campaign, Petru Rareș, Ottoman Empire, Principality of Moldova.

ВІЙСЬКО КРИМСЬКОГО ХАНСТВА У ВОЄННИХ КАМΠΑНІЯХ ПРОТИ МОЛДОВСЬКОГО КНЯЗІВСТВА (1484–1538 РР.)

Козловський Сергій Орланович,
*кандидат історичних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри історії середніх віків
та візантиністики
Львівського національного університету
імені Івана Франка
serg.kozlovskyy@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0002-4590-2433*



У статті досліджено особливості воєнних кампаній Кримського ханства, як союзника Османської імперії, проти Молдавського князівства протягом 1484-1538 рр., проаналізовано чисельність, озброєння і тактику кримців, показано процес перетворення Молдови на васальну державу Порти.

Метою дослідження є комплексний аналіз участі війська Кримського ханства у бойових діях проти Молдови 1484–1538 рр.

Методологічною основою статті є загальнонаукові принципи історизму, об'єктивності та системності. Історико-генетичний метод дозволяє простежити зміни у політичних відносинах між Портою, Кримським ханством та Молдовою. Історико-порівняльний метод дозволяє порівняти військо Молдавського князівства, Кримського ханства та Османської імперії, насамперед їх чисельний склад, тактику та особливості військового мистецтва.

Наукова новизна. У статті показано вагому роль кримських татар у підкоренні Молдови Османською імперією. Використано великий масив тогочасних нарративних джерел, праці румунських, турецьких, українських дослідників. Критично розглядаються повідомлення тогочасних хронік і літописів про битви 1518 р. та 1538 р. – головно, про кількість учасників, хід та наслідки. Доведено, що дії кримців послаблювали спроможність Молдови до опору туркам, завдавали потужного удару по мобілізаційним можливостям князівства, а також здійснювали вагомий вклад у тактичну та польову розвідку османів. Простежено, що Молдова так й не змогла знайти дієвих союзників з-поміж інших держав, а Польща через конфлікт за Покуття виступала ситуативним союзником Порти, зокрема у кампанії 1538 р.

Висновки. Турецькі султани почали залучати татар для набігів на молдовські території ще з другої половини XV ст., як інструмент тиску, залакування та покарання. Набіг татар 1518 р. завершився для них провалом, оскільки молдавське військо завдяки нічним маневрам змогло розгромити табір кримців та вело переслідування ворога. Відносини Молдови та Порти значно загострилися в роки правління господаря Петру Рареша. Доведено, що військова кампанія Порти 1538 р. мала цілу низку причин, насамперед через дії молдавського господаря П. Рареша, стратегічні цілі та необхідність отримання плацдарму для подальших кампаній проти європейських держав. Зроблено висновок, що князівство у 1538 р. не змогло у повному обсязі мобілізувати військо через дії татар та опір молдавської еліти (бояр), господар не зміг дати ворогу вирішальний бій у заздальній обраному місці. Кримське ханство завдяки застосуванню вдалої тактики та маневрів активно сприяло захопленню Молдови османами. Завдяки високій мобільності, кримці займалися тактичною розвідкою на полі бою, здійснювали відволікаючі маневри та залучалися османами для збору фуражу та припасів на території Молдови.

Ключові слова: Кримське ханство, військо, військове мистецтво, Пізні Середньовіччя, битви, тактика, кампанія, Петру Рареш, Османська імперія, Молдавське князівство.

1. Introduction

Moldova occupied an important place in the foreign policy of the Ottoman Empire, primarily as a springboard for attacks on Hungary, the Habsburg state and other European monarchies. The rulers of Moldova tried to get rid of the influence of the Ottomans, which led to a fierce confrontation. In order to keep Moldova in the sphere of their interests, the sultans involved it in military campaigns against the principality of the Crimean Tatars.

Historiography of the issue. The confrontation of Moldova with the Ottoman Empire and the Crimean Khanate was covered in the works of N. Iorga, S. Gorovei, M. Guboglu, I. Ursu and others. M. Chuchko and N. Zacharia focus their attention on the campaign of 1538, as a result of which the Porte removed the Moldavian ruler Petru Rareș. Romanian historian M. Adauzhe is the only one among other scientists who examines the battle near Ștefenesti, proving that it took place in 1518 and not in 1538 as other researchers claimed.

The purpose of the study is a comprehensive analysis of the participation of the Crimean Khanate army in the hostilities against Moldova in 1484–1538.

The methodological basis of the article is the general scientific principles of historicism, objectivity and systematicity. The historical-genetic method allows us to trace changes in relations between the Porte and Moldova. The historical-comparative method allows us to compare the army of Moldova, the Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire, primarily its numerical composition, tactics.

2. Moldova in the orbit of the Ottoman Empire and the Crimean Khanate

The Principality of Moldova came into the field of view of the rulers of the Ottoman Empire primarily as a bridgehead, a springboard for an attack on Hungarian territories (Balukh, 2021: 4). In 1420, the Ottomans tried to capture the city of Kiliya at the mouth of the Danube, but they failed. In 1456, the Moldavian ruler Petru III Aron paid the Sultan a tribute of 2 thousand gold coins, following the example of Wallachia, so that the principality would not be captured by the Ottomans (Uricariul, 1993: 53). Relations between Moldova and the Porte worsened during the reign of the Moldavian ruler Stephen III the Great, as a result of which several large-scale military conflicts took place between the countries. Thus, on January 10, 1475, near the city of Vaslui, a united army of Moldovans, Hungarians, Poles and other allies (totaling up to 50 thousand soldiers) met in battle with a large Ottoman army, which included a significant contingent of Vlachs and Bulgarians – a total of 100–150 thousand soldiers (Kármán, Kunčević, 2013: 125; Стрийковський, 2011: 194). It should be noted that according to J. Długosz, the Ottomans numbered only 30 thousand (Długosz, 1997: 588). Stephen himself chose the battlefield – a valley that was a semi-oval, surrounded on all sides by hills covered with forest. Inside the valley, the terrain was swampy, which limited the movement of troops (Iorga, 1966: 149). In addition, a thick fog hung over the battlefield, and the Ottomans did not conduct thorough reconnaissance. The Moldovans lured the enemy into a trap – the Ottomans and their allies came under artillery and archer

fire, only part of their troops was able to cross the Birlad River before the wooden bridge collapsed, and then the soldiers found themselves in a swampy area, attacked from different sides. The commander of the Ottoman army – the beylerbey of Rumelia – Suleiman, lost control of the soldiers, as a result of which the army was defeated, losing more than 40 thousand fighters (Liviu, Ovidiu, 2018: 149). However, Stephen III was unable to take advantage of the results of the victory, not receiving effective assistance from European allies. The Turkish ruler Mehmed II gathered a large army and again invaded the territory of the principality. Moreover, Moldova was attacked by Tatar troops, who, together with the Ottomans, captured most of Bessarabia and controlled the southern mouth of the Danube (Shaw, 1976: 68). The Tatar troops were probably commanded by karachi-bek, the head of the Shirin clan – Eminek. The Moldavian lord was forced to release part of the army so that the soldiers could defend their homes from the Tatars, so his army numbered only 12-20 thousand soldiers. Making maximum use of the terrain, with forests and swamps, Stefan avoided battles in open areas, set up ambushes for the enemy, and used the “scorched earth” tactic. However, the numerical superiority of the enemy allowed the Ottomans to surround the Moldavian army from several sides in the White Valley (Valea Alba) on July 26. The Moldavian soldiers created fortified positions, repelled several enemy attacks, but suffered heavy losses and a number of tactical defeats. Stephen III retreated to the northwestern part of the principality (and possibly to Poland), the Ottomans failed to capture a number of powerful fortresses, including Suceava and Khotyn, their army suffered from famine and a plague epidemic, and the sultan decided to retreat from the territory of Moldova (Bărbulescu, 2002: 157–158). In the end, seeing that the principality was suffering enormous losses from the conflict with the Porte, the Moldavian lord decided to become a vassal of the sultan, paying the latter an annual tribute, although Moldova retained the right to conduct foreign policy.

The Ottoman sultans attracted Tatar detachments for military campaigns against Moldova and European states, because: firstly, they sought to protect their own army from heavy losses, and secondly, they knew about the effective tactics of the Crimean light cavalry. The Crimean Khanate had limited human resources (in the 16th century, the population of the state was 200–300 thousand people), so even under conditions of large-scale mobilization of men, the khan could gather an army of several tens of thousands of people, and even then not all of them were experienced, fully armed and protected by armor warriors (Kozlovskiy, 2025b: 89). Since the main emphasis of the Tatar army was on mobility and maneuverability, heavy weapons had to be sacrificed – only in major campaigns did the Crimeans use artillery (a maximum of several dozen

guns, mostly light), so they had limited opportunities to storm various fortifications (Kozlovskiy, 2025a: 129). At the same time, in open terrain, the Crimean horse archers could use various tactical techniques, lure the enemy into ambushes, strike from the flanks and rear, and much more (Kozlovskiy, 2025c: 59). The sultans also understood perfectly well that the strategy and military doctrine of the Crimeans were based on the destruction of the economic and demographic potential of enemy states, so such states would be easier to conquer (Storozhenko, 2004: 102). The Tatars were to disrupt mobilization in the Moldavian lands, destroy settlements, attack the logistics of the enemy army, sow panic, destroy individual military units, and much more. The Crimean khans participated in the military campaigns of the Porte for various reasons. First, in this way they did not want to lose the protection and support of the Ottomans. Second, the Tatars received many gifts, funds, and could count on great booty. Third, the khans considered Moldova and Wallachia as potential vassals, since they occupied territories that previously belonged to the Horde (many Tatars lived in Budzhak, the territories in the steppe between Akerman and Kiliya, on the Lower Danube).

In 1484, the Sultan, having gathered up to 60 thousand soldiers together with the Crimean Tatars, set off on another campaign against Moldova and on July 6 the siege of Cilicia began, the garrison of which numbered only 400 soldiers (Manea, 1995: 204). Eight days later the fortress capitulated, and the result of the campaign was that the Ottomans gained control over Budjak (Costin, 2006: 51). According to researchers S. Gorovei and M. Szekelly, in 1486 Moldova and the Porte concluded an agreement according to which the principality became a vassal of the empire (Gorovei, Szekelly, 2005: 239–240). The Moldavian lord sent a detachment of 600–2,000 soldiers to the Ottomans, who fought with the Poles in 1497–1498. Later, Stefan sent an army to support the military leader Malkochoğlu Bali Bey, who also attacked Poland. For military service, the Moldavian lord received gifts from the Sultan, including a sable kaftan (Uzunçarşılı, 1964: 186). In addition, the principality paid 4,000 gold coins to the Porte every year, which was another confirmation of vassal dependence (Guboğlu, 1969: 55). Such dependence, submission, was called in Turkish documents – “asservire”. In 1492, the Moldavian lord concluded a treaty with the Crimeans, according to which Moldova provided the Khanate with funds and gifts (temporary indemnity) to protect the principality from Tatar raids.

3. Tatar campaigns in Moldova 1510–1518. Battle of Ștefanesti

After the death of Stephen III, a slow decline in political activity began in Moldova. The new ruler, Bogdan III the One-Eyed, tried to escape from the influence of Istanbul and became close to the Hungarians

and Poles. In 1510, Moldova concluded an alliance with Poland – both countries pledged not to join coalitions of enemy states and to inform each other about the movements of Ottoman troops. Bogdan III pledged not to provide military assistance to the Porte, and Sigismund I promised to provide shelter to the ruler and help him regain the throne in the event of Turkish aggression (Hurmuzaki, 1940: 458).

In 1510, Moldova was involved in the civil war between the rulers of the Porte. Sultan Bayezid II declared his eldest son Ahmed as his successor, while the Sultan's youngest son, Selim, with the support of the Janissaries, started an uprising and arrived in Crimea, where he was supported by the Kafin sanjak Suleiman (governor of Kafa) and Khan Mengli I Gerai (Gonța, 2015: 27). The ruler of Wallachia supported Selim, while the Moldavian master maneuvered between Selim and Bayezid II. Since Moldova paid tribute to Bayezid II, Selim ordered the Tatars to attack the principality in response in August 1510. The Tatar attack is mentioned in the “Chronicle of Grigore Ureke”: *“Beti Gerai, the sultan, the son of the khan, the nephew of the emperor, without warning with a large crowd of Tatars entered the country in three places and plundered from Orhei to Dorogoi and above the Prut, took much booty, enslaved people and captured a lot of cattle. Then the sultan, being very badly wounded by arrows, died”* (Costin, 2006: 54). The Tatar raid was repelled, and the Moldavian lord asked the Polish king to release the Horde khan Sheikh Ahmed, who had been in Poland since 1504, from captivity, but the Polish monarch did not do this. In January 1512, Selim concluded an agreement with Bogdan III against Bayezid II, receiving the right to collect taxes in the lands near the mouth of the Danube, including the town of Isaccia/Oblucica (Cuboglu, 1966: 193). In April 1512, Bayezid II, not wanting to plunge the state into a whirlpool of confrontation, under pressure from Selim, abdicated the throne in favor of his younger son, and Moldova became even more dependent on the Porte (Costin, 2006: 59). Perhaps such actions of the Moldavian ruler were due to the fact that he sought protection from Tatar raids. Grigore Ureche claims that in 1513 another Tatar raid on Moldova took place: *“Khan Mengli I Gerai plundered Lithuania as far as Vilnius, causing much damage and capturing many slaves. At the same time, Khan Beti Gerai's son entered Moldova, plundered the country as far as Iasi, burned the territory of the Karlegaturia, and even reached Dorohoiu and Ștefanesti. And others plundered as far as Lepusna and Chigheciu, wanting to get out with the slaves, many souls drowned in the Dniester, both slaves and their own. And Bogdan sent his voivode Corpaciu against them, who struck them with a thousand men. And having given battle, seven hundred of our men fell, and three hundred fled. And the Tatars, having suffered greater losses from the water than from the army, returned to Perekop”* (Costin, 2006: 62).

A much larger-scale Tatar raid took place in early August 1518, but for some reason these events were not reflected in historiography, perhaps due to confusion in different sources. Attention was drawn to another Tatar campaign by the Romanian researcher M. Adauge, who processed a large array of Turkish, Moldavian and Wallachian sources and compared their information. According to the researcher, the Tatar invasion took place along the Prut – Chugur – Ștefanesti – Șerbaca route (Adauge, 2012: 75). Although the Romanian researcher N. Iorga, relying on Moldavian and Polish chronicles, claims that the Tatars advanced much further south than the Chugur, reaching the mouth of the Sarata in the Falci area (Fălciului) (Iorga, 1910: 219–220). The reason for the Tatar campaign was the foreign policy pursued by the political leadership of the principality. On April 22, 1517, lord Bogdan III died and his son Stefan IV became the ruler, but since he was a minor, the state was actually ruled by the princely council headed by the regent, the castellan of Suceava – Luka Arbor. L. Arbor had considerable experience in military art – from a young age he accompanied his father on various military campaigns (he witnessed the storming of the fortress of Nyamc by Mehmed II's army), in 1497 he led the defense of Suceava from the Polish army (Nistor, 2002: 365–366). On March 9, 1518, in Krakow, Stephen IV, with the assistance of the regent, concluded a secret alliance treaty with Poland, according to which the Polish king Sigismund I undertook to defend Moldova and Wallachia from the Ottomans, in return for which the master undertook to side with Poland in the event of a conflict between the latter and the Porte (Eremia, 1992: 145). Apparently, the sultan learned about the agreement and, since he did not have his own forces to punish the master (the Turks had been waging another war with the Safavids since 1514), he sent the Tatars against Moldova.

According to various sources, the Tatar army numbered 20–25 thousand soldiers (Adauge, 2012: 78). Turkish chronicles greatly overstate the number of Tatars, giving figures of 70, 100, and even 200 thousand (Guboglu, Mehmet, 1966: 227, 254, 535). However, N. Iorga reduces this figure to 15 thousand people (Iorga, 1910: 221). There is no reliable information about who commanded this army – the sons of the khan, the military leaders of Budjak, murzas, and representatives of the most influential families of the Khanate are mentioned. There is also no reliable data on the size of the Moldavian army. R. Rosetti claims that in 1509–1536 the army of the principality numbered approximately 30 thousand soldiers (Rosetti, 1947: 333). M. Adauge notes that during large-scale conflicts and total mobilization the lord could gather 70 thousand soldiers and in a limited period, for example during sudden enemy attacks – 20–25 thousand (Adauge, 2012: 79). T. Movileanu writes that by the middle of the 16th century,

the Moldavian army numbered up to 40 thousand soldiers (Movileanu, 2013: 122).

The Khanate army moved along the same route as during the attacks of 1510 and 1513, and the Moldavian commanders were informed in time about the enemy invasion, gathered an army near Chirleu and headed to the mouth of the Coroviea River to intercept the Tatars near Ștefanești, where the pass was located. The Tatars crossed the Prut River and on August 8, their scouts discovered a Moldovan camp south of Ștefanești, set up their own camp and planned to attack the Moldovans on August 8. Meanwhile, along the Prut River, detachments of boyar troops and armed peasants from the southeastern counties of Moldova, mainly Cara de Jos, were heading towards Ștefanești (Adauga, 2012: 81). The commander of the Moldavian army, Luca Arbor, instructed the vornicul Petru Carabăț (P. Cărăbăț) to lead the mentioned detachments, secretly cross the Prut, advance along the left bank of the river, then cross the Prut again in the opposite direction and thus find themselves in the rear of the Tatars (Giurescu, 1943: 140; Costin, 2006: 71). P. Carabăț's detachments crossed the Prut at night, finding themselves 2–3 km behind the Crimeans. Petru Carabăț's army probably crossed through a secret ford, which the Tatars did not know about, north of the village of Costești, where the river made a bend. At the same time, the second part of the Moldavian army approached the Tatar camp at night and waited for dawn.

On the morning of August 9, the Moldovans attacked Crimeans from two sides at the same time (Bogdan, 1895: 128). Not being ready for battle, the Tatars panicked, their main part crossed the Prut River near the village of Costesti, many soldiers drowned. These events were reflected in Grigor Ureka, but the chronicler mistakenly placed them under 1538: “*On Monday morning, at dawn, they [the Moldavians] attacked them [the Tatars] without warning, when they had no caution and fortunately for Stephen, they defeated them, and many Tatars died, many drowned in the Prut and were swallowed up by Chugur. And many they [the Moldavians] captured alive, including two great Murzas, namely Tamiza and Bikaza. And those who remained, they pursued through the fields, cutting them down and shooting them, all the way to the Dniester. There, the horses, tired from the long journey, entered the Dniester and drowned. Only the khan and a few escaped, but he was also seriously wounded in the head, so they returned with great losses and disgrace. Even those who escaped fled without weapons and without horses*” (Costin, 2006: 71). According to the chronicler, the army was commanded by Alp Geray – one of the sons of Khan Mehmed I Geray.

References to the defeat of the Tatars can be found in other sources. In the Moldavian chronicles, we can read the following: “*On August 14, the Tatars came to the Moldavian land, first of all to the town at the mouth of the Prut – Shcherbanca; those Tatars were*

commanded by Alb-Sultan and ordered the land to be burned. And Stefan the voivode gathered his army and went against it alone along the mountain above the Prut. And he sent to Karabets, his great janitor, to cross the Prut with the entire Lower Country to him. And he ordered him to attack the Tatars at dawn on Monday. And he did, and the janitor attacked them, struck them and killed many, and took many alive as prisoners, and they also caught two great murzas, and they chased and beat the others across the field, killing and chopping them down to the Dniester, so that only with a small number of people did that Alb-Sultan escape. And Stefan the voivode returned to Khirlov because he himself had participated in that battle” (Grekul, 1976: 122). The Putnian Chronicle states: “*In the year 7026 (1518), on August 9, voivode Stefan defeated the Tatars near the Prut and pursued them across the field to Chughur, killing them and capturing their leaders*” (Vladescu, 1925: 132). The “Chronicle of Macarius” also tells how host Stefan defeated the Tatars, many of them drowned in the Prut and Chughur (Bogdan, 1891: 200).

M. Adauga notes that in the defeat of the Tatars, the Moldavian army used a number of elements of military art – a carefully planned wide bypass of the enemy from the rear, a night march, a sudden attack at dawn, when the enemy was not expecting it, and the pursuit of the Crimeans for their final defeat (Adauga, 2012: 83). There is no information about the losses of the Moldovans and Tatars during the clash, in the Moldavian chronicles the losses of the Tatars are described as “many”. It could have been hundreds, or possibly several thousand, given that the Crimeans were accompanied on their campaigns by a large number of auxiliary personnel who performed various tasks – collecting supplies and fodder, transporting prisoners, etc.

4. Aggravation of relations between Moldova and the Porte

The successful repulse of the Tatar attack in 1518 did not help Moldova free itself from vassalage and weaken the influence of the Porte. After the conquest of Egypt in 1517, the Sultan, in addition to various titles, received the title of Islamic Caliph and began to be considered the protector of the entire Islamic world. In the spring of 1521, Ottoman envoys arrived in Suceava, conveying to the master the Sultan's demand to provide a military contingent for joint military operations against the Hungarians (Ali Mehmet, 1976: 13). The principality's leadership was slow to respond, but the Sultan instead sent warnings threatening the Moldovans with punishment for refusing to participate in the military campaign. Moldova's position was further weakened when the Ottomans captured Belgrade on August 29, 1521, and the defense system of the Kingdom of Hungary, a potential ally of Moldova, effectively collapsed. The master could not

resist the Porte also because Poland did not want to enter into conflict with the Turks and did not support the principality (Costăchescu, 1993: 532). Despite this, during 1523-1524, Moldavian troops attacked the Ottoman garrisons in Cîlîea and Cetatea-Alba (Bilhorod-Dnistrovskyi), as well as the Tatar settlements in Budjak, as the Tatars, returning from campaigns against Transylvania, plundered Moldavian villages (Celichowski, Kętrzyński, 1952: 697). At the same time, as a sign of vassalage, in May 1526, the owner, after paying tribute, sent gifts (*peşcheş*) to the sultan at his camp near Filibe (Plovdiv) – 40 pieces of sable fur, 5 pieces of ermine fur and other things that were purchased in Muscovy (Maxim, 2008: 50). After the defeat of Hungary in the Battle of Mohács in 1526 and the death of the Hungarian monarch, Moldova lost a potential ally in the fight against the Porte. It is worth noting that the Moldavian master did not provide the Sultan with a military contingent on the eve of the battle, which also led to an even greater confrontation with the Ottoman Empire.

Relations between the Porte and Moldavia became tense after Petru IV Rareş (1527-1538 and 1541-1546) became the first ruler of the principality, who wanted to free himself from Ottoman influence, and the Sultan, in turn, wanted his protegee, Stefan V Lacusta, to lead the state. The Sultan was annoyed by the fact that Petru Rareş allowed himself not to pay tribute to Istanbul in some years and fought with Poland over Pokuttya. At first, Rareş did not conflict with the Sultan, behaved quite loyally to the Ottomans, and in August 1527 sent to Istanbul a tribute increased by the Sultan, in the amount of 10 thousand gold coins (Gonța, 2015: 35; Ursu, 2008: 33). The Moldovans regularly sent detailed reports to Istanbul on the military and political situation in the region (Tappe, 1964: 26). In 1529, the host provided the sultan with a military contingent for a campaign in Transylvania. On June 22, near Feldior (near Brasov, Transylvania), the Moldavian army defeated the Austrians, and later the Moldavians defeated several enemy detachments. In response, King János Zápolya presented Rareş with several Transylvanian fortresses, including Cetatea de Balte, Rodna, Ungoraş, Bystrica, and others (Guboğlu, 1986: 740). In 1530, the Moldavian prince launched a military campaign against Poland, which, however, proved unsuccessful, as the Moldavians suffered several defeats, including near Obertin, on August 22, 1531, as a result of which the principality lost only up to 8 thousand soldiers killed (Davies, 2012: 102).

In the spring of 1531, the Sultan, in his correspondence with the leaders of European states, advised to stop direct relations with Suceava and to turn to Istanbul, since the rulers of Wallachia and Moldova were “*tribute payers and slaves of the Sultan*”, and their possessions were the property of the Porte (Hurmuzaki, 1900: 21). According to the treaty concluded between Poland and the Ottoman Empire in 1533, Moldova and

Wallachia were recognized as vassals of the Sultan. Already in 1534, after several military campaigns of Moldova against Poland, the Sultan finally decided to overthrow Rareş from the Moldavian throne by military means, but was unable to launch a military campaign due to the confrontation with the Safavids. Under such circumstances, Petru Rareş initiated a political rapprochement with the Habsburg Empire, deciding to break off relations with the Porte and Poland. Relations between the principality and the Porte were aggravated by the murder of the regent of Hungary – Alvise Gritti, who was an advisor to the Sultan and a close associate of the Grand Vizier Ibrahim Pasha. In 1534, A. Gritti arrived in Transylvania, where he was supposed to settle the disputed issues between the kings János Zápolya and Ferdinand, but the diplomat sought to seize power in Transylvania and transfer Moldova and Wallachia to his sons (Gorovei, 1982: 113, 115). On the orders of A. Gritti, was killed the Transylvanian voivode Emeric Čibac, which provoked an uprising of the local population, which was supported by the Austrians. Petru Rareş and János Zápolya were forced to send troops to suppress the rebellion. A. Gritti and two thousand Janissaries hid in the fortress of Mediaş, in southern Transylvania. Soon the troops of the Transylvanian voivode Stefan Mailat and the Moldavian boyar Teodor Bubujoc approached the fortress, who, instead of providing assistance to A. Gritti, laid siege to Mediaş. On September 28, the garrison capitulated, and A. Gritti and his two sons were executed (Iorga, 1937: 369). Knowing that the Sultan would not forgive the murder of A. Gritti, the Moldavian prince concluded an alliance with the Habsburgs on April 4, 1535, under which he undertook not to allow Turkish troops through the territory of Moldova and not to visit Istanbul (Decsei, 1970: 140). In May, the Moldovans concluded agreements against the Ottomans with the voivode of Transylvania – Stefan Mailat, and the prince of Wallachia – Vlad VIII Vintila. According to O. Balukh, the master sought to provoke a conflict between Poland and the Porte in this way (Балух, 2021: 5). In the summer of 1535, the Moldavian troops attacked Pokuttya (where they burned about 100 villages) and Podillia, but in August they were stopped by the detachments of M. Sieniawski and were forced to retreat. In December, the Moldavian army conducted a small military expedition to Pokuttya, which, according to the Poles, was intended to distract part of their forces from the confrontation with Muscovy (Plewczyński, 2011: 394).

5. Campaign of 1538

After the end of the war with the Safavids, in 1536, Sultan Suleiman I offered his master to take part in the campaign against the Habsburgs and provide the Hungarian king Janos I Zápolya with a 6,000-strong military contingent. The ruler of the Porte promised to forget about the incident with A. Gritti and help in the conquest of Pokuttya, and Zápolya promised

to provide large funds and gifts (Zaharia, 2011: 20). Rareș distrusted the Ottomans and refused the Sultan, which was regarded by the Ottomans as a betrayal and a challenge (Чучко, 2018: 246). In November 1537 – February 1538, hostilities broke out again between Poland and Moldova, on February 1, the Moldavian army defeated the Polish border troops on the Seret River, resulting in the death of up to 900 soldiers.

On February 24, 1538, Ferdinand I Habsburg and Janos Zápolya, mediated by Pope Paul III, concluded an agreement under which Ferdinand I transferred Transylvania and Eastern Hungary to Zápolya, but on the condition that after the latter's death all his possessions would pass to the Habsburgs. Later, Petru Rareș joined the alliance between Zápolya and the Habsburgs. With this step, the Moldavian ruler also sought to intimidate the Polish king into making concessions regarding Pokuttia, however, Sigismund I sided with the Sultan. In May 1538, the Polish monarch appealed to the Sultan to overthrow P. Rareș and replace him with a more loyal Polish ruler, in return for which the Poles wanted Moldova to remain a buffer state and not be annexed to the Ottoman Empire. The Sultan agreed to replace Petru Rareș with a more loyal candidate (Guboglu, 1956: 111).

Preparing for a military campaign against Moldova, the Sultan gathered a large army, numbering from 120 to 240 thousand people (Setton, 1984: 444). Of course, the sources often overestimate the size of the Ottoman army. The Crimeans were also involved in the campaign – according to M. Guboğlu's calculations, the army of Sahib I Gerai numbered 15–20 thousand soldiers (Guboğlu, 1986: 740). Although one can find much smaller figures for the number of the khanate's troops – 8–10 thousand (Hammer, 1834: 152). Also, there is no exact data on the number of the Moldavian army. Petru Rareș claimed that he could gather 45 thousand soldiers (Movileanu, 2013: 121). Researcher A. Veranchic indicated that in the event of a large-scale mobilization, the host could gather 60–70 thousand soldiers and this is confirmed by the data of Transylvanian diplomats (Holban, 1968: 199; Istoria militară, 1986: 40). Papal nuncio Fabio Mignanelli claimed that Moldova could muster 30,000 soldiers (Holban, 1968: 464–465).

The Sultan's campaign against Moldova began on July 9, 1538. The Ottomans crossed the Danube and invaded the principality. Petru Rareș, like his predecessors, sought to lure the enemy into difficult terrain, severely limit the maneuverability of his troops, and defeat him in battle. However, the master's plans were thwarted by the actions of the Poles, who actually acted as the Sultan's allies – a 20,000-strong army besieged the Khotyn fortress on August 18 (Чучко, 2018: 256). Petru Rareș hastily concluded peace with Poland, pledged not to make any more claims to Pokuttia, and to compensate for the losses incurred during attacks on the Polish border.

The Crimean army also went on a campaign. The Khan mobilized, ordered the soldiers to gather on the left bank of the Dnieper within ten days, taking with them a three-month supply of food. Those who did not appear were threatened with confiscation of property (herds and pastures) and even the death penalty. The Khan took 40 light cannons-zarbutzans and a thousand archers-tyufenkji on the campaign (Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han, 1973: 165). The soldiers of the influential Baryn, Shirin, Mangyt and Kipchak families participated in the campaign. Near the Dnieper, the Crimeans were attacked by a detachment of 500 Nogais under the command of Aksak Ali Mirza. The Tatars defeated the Nogais, captured 50 prisoners, who were executed by order of the Khan. Then the Crimeans crossed the Dnieper for three days. Later, the Khan's army crossed the Dniester River and set up camp. They managed to capture several prisoners, who claimed that the master had hidden the treasures in his father-in-law's fortress, which was located behind the mountain, and his army was decreasing every day, since the nobles with their detachments were leaving the prince (Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han, 1973: 165). The prisoners were executed. The Crimean army broke into Moldova, began to plunder and ravage its territories, as described by Remal Khoja: *"The next day, at dawn, they set out on the road, the people of the Bogdan vilayet [Moldova], leaving their homes, each one alone, moved in a whole stream for certain reasons to the steep mountains. The army set foot on the Bogdan border. Sweeping and burning everything in its path, they moved forward. Bogdan Bey saw that no one was left next to him. And one night he himself disappeared, and no one knew where he had gone. This time the Tatar army found the vilayet quiet and desolate. They took away herds of horses, flocks of sheep and other livestock (kara tovar), Almighty Allah has given so many blessings to this vilayet of the infidels that there is no limit or end to them. However, hazrat khan did not allow them to take anything other than provisions"* (Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han, 1973: 166). Some historical works state that the Moldavian army defeated the Tatars near Stefanesti. Obviously, this is an error related to the confusion in dates in the Moldavian sources, as already noted. It is not excluded that the Moldavians engaged in battles with individual Tatar detachments and defeated them.

Meanwhile, on August 31, the Sultan's army camped near the town of Felchii, then the Ottomans passed through Vaslui, the Prut Valley and on September 9 entered Iași (Gorovei, 1982: 150). The Tatars joined the Ottoman army and the Khan arranged a solemn meeting with salutes (Guboglu, Mehmet, 1966: 254). According to one version, a fire broke out during the salute, as a result of which Iași burned down, along with the Orthodox churches (Hammer, 1834: 152). On September 11, the Ottomans were already near Târgu Frumos. Thinking that the Ottomans would move along the valleys of the Șișii and Siret rivers

to Suceava, Petru Rareș decided to give battle in the mountainous area of Botoșani, where the Turks could not maneuver and use their superiority in numbers. The Moldovans began to dig ditches on the roads, build embankments and trenches in the forests, but the Sultan's army included special detachments of workers, including Vlachs, who were engaged in clearing the roads (Gorovei, 1982: 152–153). Rareș's army was greatly reduced as the boyars disrupted the recruitment of peasant militias, unwilling to leave their estates without a workforce (Erdogru, 2016: 325). It is quite likely that the mobilization measures were also thwarted by the actions of the Tatars, and the boyars were forced to defend their estates from them. The Moldavian lord did not receive military contingents from Zapolya and the Habsburgs. The “Chronicle of Macarius” indicates that in September the prince met with the boyars, most of whom were in favor of Petru Rareș either asking for forgiveness from the Sultan or fleeing (Bogdan, 1891: 205). The Moldavian lord decided to leave the state – in mid-September, with his closest entourage and security, he arrived in Khotyn, intending to get to Muscovy through Poland, but the garrison of the fortress did not let him in. Perhaps this was done under pressure, as the Ottomans repeatedly wrote to the Poles asking them to capture Peter Rareș if the prince found himself on Polish territory and hand him over to the Sultan (Guboglu, 1958: 6). In such a situation, the prince set off across the mountains to Transylvania, where his fortresses, donated to Zapolya, were located. On September 18, the Ottoman army entered Suceava. Stefan Lacusta became the new Moldavian master, and the Ottomans left garrisons in Suceava and Tyahin (Bender) (Guboglu, 1956: 112). According to researcher Y. Pylypchuk, after 1538, the Crimeans controlled Chisinau, Balta, Kiliya, Dubossary and other settlements (Pylypchuk, 2016: 190). This indicates that the Crimean khans also gained influence over Moldova and controlled part of its territory. Thus, as a result of the campaign of 1538, the Sultan, with the participation of the Crimeans, managed to deprive the Moldavian master, Petru Rareș, of power and transfer power to his candidate, and capture the capital of the principality. Moldova fell into even greater vassal dependence on the Porte.

6. Conclusions

The Crimean Khanate and the Ottoman Empire considered the Principality of Moldova as a springboard for an attack on European countries, primarily Hungary, a tribute payer, a vassal who could provide military contingents. The Sultans began to involve the Tatars in raids on the Moldavian territories from the second half of the 15th century. For example, a joint campaign of the Tatars and the Ottomans took place in 1484. The involvement of the Tatars allowed the Ottomans to avoid unnecessary losses in their own army, and made the Moldavian masters more loyal

to Istanbul and more pliable. The sultans used the Crimeans as an instrument of pressure, intimidation, and punishment, because as a result of the Tatar raids, villages were destroyed and thousands of inhabitants were taken prisoner, which dealt a heavy blow to the economic potential of the state, which was much smaller than in Poland, Hungary, and other countries.

The Tatars conducted successful raids in 1510 and 1513, collected considerable booty, and left the territory of the principality virtually without losses. The campaign of 1518, which is almost not described in historiography, was completely different. The Moldavian army was prepared for resistance and was able to defeat the Crimeans near the village of Stefanesti, near the Prut River. The secret of the Moldavian success was that part of their troops imperceptibly, during a night march, bypassed the Tatar camp from the rear, and on the morning of August 9, the host's soldiers struck the enemy simultaneously from two directions. The Tatars did not expect the blow, could not resist and were defeated, although the sources do not contain statistics on the losses of the Crimeans.

Relations between Moldova and the Porte significantly worsened during the reign of the master Petru Rareș, who was involved in the execution of the Ottoman diplomat A. Gritti, entered into constant conflicts with Poland over Pokuttya (thus exposing the Porte to clashes with Poland), irregularly paid tribute and concluded an alliance with the Habsburgs. These and other actions of Petru Rareș led to the fact that Sultan Suleiman I in the summer of 1538 launched a large-scale campaign against Moldova, with the aim of depriving the current master of power. The prince sought to lure the enemy, who significantly outnumbered the Moldavian army, into difficult terrain and give a general battle there, but on August 18, the Poles began the siege of one of the key Moldavian fortresses, and the Tatar army crossed the eastern borders of Moldova. Perhaps it was because of the Tatar raid that mobilization measures in Moldova failed, and the vast majority of the elite advocated peace and concessions. The result of the 1538 campaign was that Petru Rareș lost power in favor of the Ottoman protege Stefan Lacusta, Ottoman garrisons remained in the fortresses of the principality and the capital, and the state finally became a vassal of the Porte. As a result of several successful military campaigns, the Crimean khans controlled the Moldavian territories in the middle and lower reaches of the Prut and Dniester rivers for some time. Thus, the Crimean Tatars helped the Ottoman Empire conquer Moldova, weakened it, and had a demoralizing effect on the Moldovan population and, above all, the elite. However, it is also worth remembering the fact that during the reign of Suleiman I, the Ottoman Empire was at the peak of its power, so without effective assistance from the allies, it was very difficult for Moldova to resist a powerful enemy.

Bibliography:

1. Adauge M. Invazia tătarilor în vara anului 1518 și lupta de la Ștefănești. Reconstituire. *Revista Militară. Studii de securitate și apărare*. 2012. Numărul 2(8). P. 70–87.
2. Ali Mehmet M. Documente turcești privind istoria României. Vol. I. 1455–1774. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1976. 500 p.
3. Bărbulescu M., Deletant D., Hitchins K., Papacostea S., Pompiliu T. *Istoria României*. Bucharest: Ed. Corint, 2002. 528 p.
4. Bogdan I. *Vechile cronice moldovenesci până la Urechia*. Bucuresti: C. Göbl, 1891. 290 p.
5. Bogdan I. *Cronice inedite atingătoare de istoria românilor*. București: Editura Librăriei Socec & Comp., 1895. 204 p.
6. Celichowski Z., Kętrzyński W. *Acta Temiciana*. T. XIV. Poznan: Sumptibus Instituti Nationalis Ossoliniani, 1952. 814 s.
7. Costăchescu M. *Documente moldovenești de la Ștefăniță voievod (1517–1527)*. Iași: Institutul Românesc de Arte Grafice «Brawo», 1943. 640 p.
8. Costin M. *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. Chișinău: Universul, 2006, 640 p.
9. Davies B. *Warfare in Eastern Europe, 1500–1800*. Leiden: Brill, 2012. 364 p.
10. Decei A. Aloisio Griotti în slujba sultanului Soliman Kanuni, după unele documente turcești inedite (1533–1534). *Studii și materiale de istorie medie*. 1970. vol. VII. P. 101–161.
11. Długosz J. *The Annals of Jan Długosz*. London: IM Publications, 1997. 673 p.
12. Eremia I. *Moldova în contextul relațiilor politice internaționale 1387–1858. Tratatate*. Chișinău: Ch.: Universitas, 1992. 374 p.
13. Erdogru M. An agenda of the Ottoman expedition by Suleiman the Magnificent against the castle of Suceava in 1538. *Turkey & Romania. A history of partnership and collaboration in the Balkans*. Istanbul: TDBB, 2016. P. 323–329.
14. Hammer J. *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches. Grossentheils aus bisher unbenutzten I landschriften und Archiven. Zweite verbesserte Aufgabe. Bd. 2.: Vom Regierungsantritte Suleiman des Ersten bis zum zwenten Enthronung Mustafa des Ersten. 1520–1623*. Pesth: C. A. Hartlebens Verlag, 1834. 840 s.
15. Holban M. *Călători străini despre Țările Române*. vol. I. București: Editura Științifică, 1968. 588 p.
16. Hurmuzachi E. *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor*. Supliment 2. Vol. 1. 1510–1600. Bucuresci: Stabilimentul Grafic I. V. Socecu, 1893. 652 p.
17. Hurmuzachi E. *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor*. Supliment 2. Vol. 1. 1517–1612. Bucuresci: Stabilimentul Grafic I. V. Socecu, 1900. 883 p.
18. Iorga N. *Istoria armatei românești*. Volumul I (Până la 1599). București: Neamul Romanesc, 1910. 427 p.
19. Iorga N. *Istoria romanilor*. Volumul IV. Cavalerii. Bucuresti: [s.n.], 1937. 451 p.
20. Iorga N. *Istoria lui Ștefan cel Mare*. Bucharest Pentru Literatura Universala, 1966. 296 p.
21. *Istoria militară a poporului român*, vol. II, București: Militaria, 1986. 637 p.
22. Giurescu C. *Istoria românilor*. Volumul II. Partea I. București: Fundatia Regala pentru Literatura si Arta, 1943. 415 p.
23. Gonța G. Când a devenit Țara Moldovei vasală a Imperiului Otoman? *Revista de istorie a Moldovei. Studii*. 2015, no. 1, P. 26–38.
24. Gorovei S. *Petru Rares*. București: Editura Militara, 1982. 230 p.
25. Gorovei S., Szekelly M. *Princeps omni laude maior. O istorie a lui Ștefan cel Mare*. Suceava: Editura Mușatinii, 2005. 629 p.
26. Guboglu M. Inscricția sultanului Suleiman Magnificul în urma cuceririi Moldovei (1538/945). *Studii. Revistă de istorie*. 1956. Vol. 9, nr. 2–3. P. 107–124.
27. Guboglu M. *Paleografia și diplomatia turco-osmană. Studiu și Album*. București: Ed. Acad. RPR, 1958. 352 p.
28. Guboglu M. Despre materialele arhivistice și importanța lor pentru istoria Țărilor Române. *Revista arhivelor*. 1966. nr. 2. P. 184–200.
29. Guboglu M., Mehmet M. *Cronici turcești privind Țările Române. Extrase. Volumul I. Sec. XV – mijlocul sec. XVII*. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1966. 550 p.
30. Guboglu M. Le tribut payé par les principautés roumaines à la Porte jusqu'au début du XVf siècle d'après les source turques. *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*. Paris 1969. XXXVII. 1. P. 49–80.
31. Guboglu M. Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın Boğdan Seferi ve Zaferi (1538 M. = 945 H.). *Belleten Türk Tarih Kurumu*. Aralık 1986, Cilt 50. Sayı 198. S. 727 – 806 DOI: 10.37879/belleten.1986.727
32. Kármán G.; Kunčević L. *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden: Brill, 2013. 450 p.
33. Liviu P., Ovidiu C. *The Ottoman Threat and Crusading on the Eastern Border of Christendom during the 15th Century*. Leiden: Brill, 2018. 337 p.

34. Manea M. *Istoria românilor din cele mai vechi timpuri până la Revoluția din 1821*. București: Editura didactică și pedagogică, 1995. 399 p.
35. Maxim M. *Noi documente turcești privind Țările Române și Înalta Poartă (1526–1602)*. Brăila: Editura Istros, 2008. 341 p.
36. Movileanu T. Efectivele militare din Țara Moldovei în secolele XV–XVII. *Revistă de științe socioumane*. 2013. nr. 1(23). P. 115–124.
37. Nistor I. *Istoria românilor*. Volumul 1. București: Biblioteca Bucureștilor, 2002. 662 p.
38. Plewczynski M. *Wojny i wojskowość polska XVI wieku*. T. 1: Lata 1500–1548 Zabrze: Wydawnictwo infort-editions, 2011. 459 s.
39. Rosetti R. *Istoria artei militare a românilor până la mijlocul veacului al XVII-lea*. București: Academia Romana, 1947. 622 p.
40. Setton K. *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204–1571*. Vol III. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1984. 564 p.
41. Shaw S. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*. Vol 1: Empire of Gazis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976. 368 p.
42. Tappe E. *Documents concerning Rumanian History (1421–1602)*. London, Paris: Collected from British Archives, 1964. 162 p.
43. Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han. *Histoire de Sahib Giray, khan de Crimée de 1532 à 1551*. Ed. crit., trad., notes et glossaire par Ö. Gökbilgin. Ankara: Atatürk Üniversitesi, 1973. 313 s.
44. Uricariul A. *Cronica Paralela a Moldovei Si Tarii Romanesti*. Vol. I. București: Minerva, 1993. 379 p.
45. Ursu I. *Petru Rareș*. București: Semne, 2008. 142 p.
46. Uzunçarşih I. *Osmanli tarihi. II. Cilt. İstanbul'un Fethinden Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1964. 704 s.
47. Vlădescu I. *Isvoarele istoriei românilor. Volumul 1. Letopisețul de la Bistrița și Letopisețul de la Putna*. București: Cartea Romaneasca, 1925. 138 p.
48. Zaharia N. Expediția lui Suleyman Magnificul asupra Moldovei – 1538. *Muzeul Național*. 2011. Vol. XXIII. P. 19–25.
49. Балух О. Передумови і хід молдавського походу Сулеймана Кануні 1538 р. та його наслідки для прикордонного становища Буковини. *Чорноморська минувшина: записки Відділу історії козацтва на півдні України* : зб. наук. пр. за ред. В. А. Смолія. Вип. 16. Одеса: ФОП Бондаренко М. О., 2021. Вип. 16. С. 3–9.
50. Грекул Ф. *Славяно-молдавские летописи XV–XVI вв*. Москва: Москва, 1976. 150 с.
51. Козловський С. О. Артилерія як тактична компонента військового мистецтва Кримського ханства (XV–XVI ст.). *Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Серія: Історія* : збірник наукових праць. ред. кол.: О. А. Мельничук (гол. ред.), Ю. Зінько (заступ. гол. ред.), А. Войнаровський (відповід. секретар) та ін.; Вінницький державний педагогічний університет імені Михайла Коцюбинського. Вінниця. 2025а. Вип. 53. С. 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.31652/2411-2143-2025-53-123-132>
52. Козловський С. О. Військо Кримського ханства у середині XV–XVI ст.: чисельність, людський та ресурсний потенціали. *Вчені записки Таврійського національного університету імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія: Історичні науки*. 2025b. Том 36 (75). № 2. С. 84–91. DOI: 10.32782/2663-5984.2025/2.1
53. Козловський С. О. Тактична складова військового мистецтва Кримського ханства (XV–XVI ст.). Етнічна історія народів Європи. 2025с. Випуск 77. С. 50–63. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2518-1270.2025.77.06>
54. Пилипчук Я. Кримські татари та князівства Центрально-Східної Європи, 1538–1713. *Scriptorium nostrum*. 2016. № 1. С. 188–229.
55. Стороженко І. Воєнна доктрина Кримського ханства кінця XV – середини XVII ст. *Україна–Туреччина: минуле, сучасне та майбутнє*: зб. наук. пр. Київ, Денеб, 2004. С. 99–103.
56. Стрийковський М. *Літопис польський, литовський, жмудський і всієї Руси*. Відп. ред. О. Купчинський. Історичні джерела. Т. 10. Львів: Наукове товариство ім. Шевченка, 2011. 1075 с.
57. Чучко М. Тінь османського півмісяця над Сучавою: передумови, перебіг та наслідки походу султана Сулеймана Пишного проти Молдавської землі в 1538 р. *Питання стародавньої та середньовічної історії, археології й етнології*. 2018. Т. 1. С. 231–279.

References:

1. Adauge, M. (2012). Invazia tătarilor în vara anului 1518 și lupta de la Ștefănești. Reconstituire [The Tatar invasion in the summer of 1518 and the battle of Ștefănești. Reconstruction]. *Revista Militară. Studii de securitate și apărare*. 2012. Numărul 2(8). P. 70–87.

2. Ali Mehmet, M. (1976). *Documente turcești privind istoria României. Vol. I. 1455–1774* [Turkish documents on the history of Romania. Vol. I. 1455–1774]. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România. [in Romanian].
3. Bărbulescu, M., Deletant, D., Hitchins, K., Papacostea, S., Pompiliu, T. (2002). *Istoria României* [History of Romania]. Bucharest: Ed. Corint. [in Romanian].
4. Bogdan, I. (1891). *Vechile cronice moldovenesci până la Urechia* [Old Moldavian chronicles up to Urechia]. București: C. Göbl. [in Romanian].
5. Bogdan, I. (1895). *Cronice inedite atingătoare de istoria românilor* [Unpublished chronicles touching on the history of the Romanians]. București: Editura Librăriei Socecă & Comp. [in Romanian].
6. Celichowski, Z., Kętrzyński, W. (1952). *Acta Temiciana. T. XIV*. Poznan: Sumptibus Institutii Nationalis Ossoliniani. [in Polish].
7. Costăchescu, M. (1943). *Documente moldovenești de la Ștefăniță voievod (1517–1527)* [Moldavian documents from Voivode Stefanita (1517–1527)]. Iași: Institutul Românesc de Arte Grafice «Brawo». [in Romanian].
8. Costin, M. (2006). *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei* [The Chronicle of Moldavia]. Chișinău: Universul. [in Romanian].
9. Davies, B. (2012). *Warfare in Eastern Europe, 1500–1800*. Leiden: Brill.
10. Decei, A. (1970). Aloisio Griotti în slujba sultanului Soliman Kanuni, după unele documente turcești inedite (1533–1534) [Aloisio Griotti in the service of Sultan Suleiman Kanuni, according to some unpublished Turkish documents (1533–1534)]. *Studii și materiale de istorie medie*. vol. VII. pp. 101–161.
11. Długosz, J. (1992). *The Annals of Jan Długosz*. London: IM Publications.
12. Eremia, I. (1992). *Moldova în contextul relațiilor politice internaționale 1387–1858. Tratatate* [Moldova in the context of international political relations 1387–1858. Treaties]. Chișinău: Ch.: Universitas. [in Romanian].
13. Erdogru, M. (2016). An agenda of the Ottoman expedition by Suleiman the Magnificent against the castle of Suceava in 1538 [An agenda of the Ottoman expedition by Suleiman the Magnificent against the castle of Suceava in 1538]. *Turkey & Romania. A history of partnership and collaboration in the Balkans*. Istanbul: TDBB. pp. 323–329. [in Romanian].
14. Hammer, J. (1843). *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches. Grossentheils aus bisher unbenutzten I landschriften und Archiven. Zweite verbesserte Ausgabe. Bd. 2.: Vom Regierungsantritte Suleiman des Ersten bis zum zwenen Enthronung Mustafa des Ersten. 1520–1623* [History of the Ottoman Empire. Largely based on previously unused manuscripts and archives. Second revised edition. Vol. 2: From the accession of Suleiman the First to the second dethronement of Mustafa the First. 1520–1623]. Pesth: C. A. Hartlebens Verlag. [in German].
15. Holban, M. (1968). *Călători străini despre Țările Române* [Foreign travelers about the Romanian Countries]. vol. I. București: Editura Științifică. [in Romanian].
16. Hurmuzachi, E. (1893). *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor* [Documents regarding the history of the Romanians]. Supliment 2. Vol. 1. 1510–1600. Bucuresci: Stabilimentul Grafic I. V. Socecu. [in Romanian].
17. Hurmuzachi, E. (1900). *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor* [Documents regarding the history of the Romanians]. Supliment 2. Vol. 1. 1517–1612. Bucuresci: Stabilimentul Grafic I. V. Socecu. [in Romanian].
18. Iorga, N. (1910). *Istoria armatei românești* [History of the Romanian Army]. Volumul I (Până la 1599). București: Neamul Romanesc. [in Romanian].
19. Iorga, N. (1937). *Istoria romanilor* [History of the Romans]. Volumul IV. Cavalerii. București: [s.n.]. [in Romanian].
20. Iorga, N. (1966). *Istoria lui Ștefan cel Mare* [The History of Stephen the Great]. Bucharest: Pentru Literatura Universala. [in Romanian].
21. *Istoria militară a poporului roman* [Military history of the Romanian people]. (1986). vol. II, București: Militaria. [in Romanian].
22. Giurescu, C. (1943). *Istoria românilor* [History of the Romanians]. Volumul II. Partea I. București: Fundatia Regala pentru Literatura si Arta. [in Romanian].
23. Gonța, G. (2015). Când a devenit Țara Moldovei vasală a Imperiului Otoman? [When did Moldavia become a vassal of the Ottoman Empire?] *Revista de istorie a Moldovei. Studii*. no. 1, pp. 26–38. [in Romanian].
24. Gorovei, S. (1982). *Petru Rares* [Peter Rares]. București: Editura Militara. [in Romanian].
25. Gorovei, S. m Szeckelly, M. (2005). *Princeps omni laude maior. O istorie a lui Ștefan cel Mare* [Princeps omni laude maior. A history of Stephen the Great]. Suceava: Editura Mușatinii. [in Romanian].
26. Guboglu, M. (1956). Inscripția sultanului Suleiman Magnificul în urma cuceririi Moldovei (1538/945) [Inscription of Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent following the conquest of Moldova (1538/945)]. *Studii. Revistă de istorie*. Vol. 9, nr. 2–3. pp. 107–124. [in Romanian].
27. Guboglu, M. (1958). *Paleografia și diplomatica turco-osmană. Studiu și Album* [Paleography and Ottoman-Turkish Diplomacy. Study and Album]. București: Ed. Acad. RPR. [in Romanian].

28. Guboglu, M. (1966). Despre materialele arhivistice și importanța lor pentru istoria Țărilor Române [About archival materials and their importance for the history of the Romanian Countries]. *Revista arhivelor*. nr. 2. pp. 184–200. [in Romanian].
29. Guboglu, M., Mehmet, M. (1966). *Cronici turcești privind Țările Române. Extrase. Volumul I. Sec. XV – mijlocul sec. XVII* [Turkish Chronicles on the Romanian Lands. Extracts. Volume I. Sec. 15th – mid-sec. 17th]. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România. [in Romanian].
30. Guboglu, M. (1969). Le tribut payé par les principautés roumaines à la Porte jusqu'au début du XV^e siècle d'après les source turques [The tribute paid by the Romanian principalities to the Sublime Porte until the beginning of the 15th century, according to Turkish sources]. *Revue des Etudes Islamiques*. Paris 1969. XXXVII. 1. pp. 49–80. [in Romanian].
31. Guboglu, M. (1986). Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın Boğdan Seferi ve Zaferi (1538 M. = 945 H.) [Suleiman the Magnificent's Moldavian Campaign and Victory (1538 AD = 945 AH)]. *Belleten Türk Tarih Kurumu*. Aralık. Cilt 50. Sayı 198. pp. 727–806 DOI: 10.37879/belleten.1986.727 [in Turkish].
32. Kármán, G.; Kunčević, L. (2013). *The European Tributary States of the Ottoman Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Leiden: Brill.
33. Liviu, P., Ovidiu, C. (2018). *The Ottoman Threat and Crusading on the Eastern Border of Christendom during the 15th Century*. Leiden: Brill.
34. Manea, M. (1995). *Istoria românilor din cele mai vechi timpuri până la Revoluția din 1821* [The history of the Romanians from ancient times to the Revolution of 1821]. București: Editura didactică și pedagogic. [in Romanian].
35. Maxim, M. (2008). *Noi documente turcești privind Țările Române și Înalta Poartă (1526–1602)* [New Turkish documents regarding the Romanian Countries and the Sublime Porte (1526–1602)]. Brăila: Editura Istros. [in Romanian].
36. Movileanu, T. (2013). Efectivele militare din Țara Moldovei în secolele XV–XVII [Military forces in Wallachia in the 15th–17th centuries]. *Revistă de științe socioumane*. nr. 1(23). pp. 115–124. [in Romanian].
37. Nistor, I. (2002). *Istoria românilor* [History of the Romanians]. Volumul 1. București: Biblioteca Bucureștilor, 2002. [in Romanian].
38. Plewczyński, M. (2011). *Wojny i wojskowość polska XVI wieku. T. 1: Lata 1500–1548* [Polish Wars and Military Affairs of the 16th Century. Part 1: 1500–1548]. Zabrze: Wydawnictwo inforteditions. [in Polish].
39. Rosetti, R. (1947). *Istoria artei militare a românilor până la mijlocul veacului al XVII-lea* [The history of the military art of the Romanians until the middle of the 17th century]. București: Academia Romana. [in Romanian].
40. Setton, K. (1984). *The Papacy and the Levant, 1204–1571*. Vol III. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
41. Shaw, S. (1976). *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*. Vol 1: Empire of Gazis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
42. Tappe, E. (1964). *Documents concerning Rumanian History (1421–1602)*. London, Paris: Collected from British Archives.
43. Tarih-i Sahib Giray Han. (1973). *History de Sahib Giray, khan de Crimée de 1532 à 1551*. Ed. crit., trad., notes et glossaire par Ö. Gökbilgin. Ankara: Atatürk Üniversitesi. [in Turkish].
44. Uricariu, A. (1993). *Cronica Paralela a Moldovei Si Tarii Romanesti* [Parallel Chronicle of Moldova and Wallachia]. Vol. I. București: Minerva. [in Romanian].
45. Ursu, I. (2008). *Petru Rareș* [Petru Rareș]. București: Semne. [in Romanian].
46. Uzunçarşılı, I. (1964). *Osmanlı tarihi. II. Cilt. İstanbul'un Fethinden Kanuni Sultan Süleyman'ın* [Ottoman History. Volume II. From the Conquest of Istanbul to the Reign of Suleiman the Magnificent]. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi. [in Turkish].
47. Vlădescu, I. (1925). *Isvoarele istoriei românilor. Volumul 1. Letopisețul de la Bistrița și Letopisețul de la Putna* [The Sources of Romanian History. Volume 1. The Chronicle of Bistrița and the Chronicle of Putna]. București: Cartea Romaneasca. [in Romanian].
48. Zaharia, N. (2011). Expediția lui Suleyman Magnificul asupra Moldovei – 1538. *Muzeul Național* [Suleyman the Magnificent's expedition to Moldova – 1538. National Museum]. Vol. XXIII. pp. 19–25. [in Romanian].
49. Balukh, O. (2021). Peredumovy i khid moldavskoho pokhodu Suleimana Kanuni 1538 r. ta yoho naslidky dlia prykordonnoho stanovyshcha Bukovyny [Prerequisites and course of the Moldavian campaign of Suleiman the Magnificent in 1538 and its consequences for the border situation of Bukovina]. *The Black Sea past: notes of the Department of Cossack history in southern Ukraine: collection of scientific works*, edited by V. A. Smoliya. Issue 16. Odesa: FOP Bondarenko M. O. Issue 16. pp. 3–9. [in Ukrainian].
50. Grekul, F. (1976). *Slavyano-moldavskie letopisi XV–XVI vv.* [Slavic-Moldavian Chronicles of the 15th–16th Centuries]. Moskva: Nauka. [in Russian].

51. Kozlovskiy, S. O. (2025a). Artyleriiia yak taktychna komponenta viiskovoho mystetstva Krymskoho khanstva (XV–XVI st.) [Artillery as a tactical component of the military art of the Crimean Khanate (15th–16th centuries)]. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Serii: Istoriiia: zbirnyk naukovykh prats. red. kol.: O. A. Melnychuk (hol. red.), Yu. Zinko (zastup. hol. red.), A. Voinarovskiy (vidpovid. sekretar) ta in.; Vinnytskyi derzhavnyi pedahohichnyi universytet imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Vinnytsia. Vyp. 53. pp. 123–132. <https://doi.org/10.31652/2411-2143-2025-53-123-132> [in Ukrainian].*
52. Kozlovskiy, S. O. (2025b). Viisko Krymskoho khanstva u seredyni XV–XVI st.: chyselnist, liudskiy ta resursnyi potentsialy [The army of the Crimean Khanate in the mid-15th–16th centuries: numbers, human and resource potential]. *Vcheni zapysky Tavriiskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni V.I. Vernadskoho. Serii: Istorychni nauky. Tom 36 (75). № 2. pp. 84–91. DOI: 10.32782/2663-5984.2025/2.1 [in Ukrainian].*
53. Kozlovskiy, S. O. (2025c). Taktychna skladova viiskovoho mystetstva Krymskoho khanstva (XV–XVI st.) [Tactical component of the military art of the Crimean Khanate (15th–16th centuries)]. *Etnichna istoriiia narodiv Yevropy. Vypusk 77. pp. 50–63. <https://doi.org/10.17721/2518-1270.2025.77.06> [in Ukrainian].*
54. Pylypchuk, Ya. (2016). Krymski tatory ta kniazivstva Tsentralno-Skhidnoi Yevropy, 1538–1713 [Crimean Tatars and the Principalities of Central and Eastern Europe, 1538–1713]. *Scriptorium nostrum. № 1. pp. 188–229. [in Ukrainian].*
55. Storozhenko, I. (2004). Voienna doktryna Krymskoho khanstva kintsia XV – seredyny XVII st. [Military doctrine of the Crimean Khanate of the late 15th – mid-17th centuries.]. *Ukraina–Turechchyna: mynule, suchasne ta maibutnie: zb. nauk. pr. Kyiv, Deneb. pp. 99–103. [in Ukrainian].*
56. Strykovskiy, M. (2011). *Litopys polskiy, lytovskiy, zhmujskyy i vsiiei Rusy* [Chronicle of Poland, Lithuania, Samogitia and All Russia]. Vidp. red. O. Kupchynskiy. Istorychni dzherela. T. 10. Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka. [in Ukrainian].
57. Chuchko, M. (2018). Tin osmanskoho pivmisiatsia nad Suchavoiu: peredumovy, perebih ta naslidky pokhodu sultana Suleimana Pyshnoho proty Moldavskoi zemli v 1538 r. [The shadow of the Ottoman crescent over Suceava: the preconditions, course and consequences of the campaign of Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent against the Moldavian land in 1538]. *Pytannia starodavnoi ta serednovichnoi istorii, arkeolohii y etnolohii. T. 1. pp. 231–279. [in Ukrainian].*

Date of initial submission: 23.02.2026
Date of acceptance after peer review: 17.03.2026
Publication date: 07.04.2026

UDC 002.1(044.4):94(477)“1648/179”

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2026-53-2>

REGIMENTAL AND COMPANY-LEVEL ACCOUNTING AND STATISTICAL DOCUMENTS IN THE SYSTEM OF OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION OF THE HETMANATE

Lemish Nataliia Oleksandrivna,

*Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Department of Social
and Humanitarian Disciplines*

*Separate Subdivision «Nizhyn Agrotechnical Institute»
of the National University of Life and Environmental
Sciences of Ukraine*

natalem@ukr.net

orcid.org/0000-0002-5124-5687

This study focuses on regimental and company-level accounting and statistical records as an essential component of the system of official communication within the Hetmanate during the second half of the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries. **The primary aim** of the research is to determine their functional purpose, informational capacity, and role in maintaining administrative interaction between the governing institutions of the Cossack state. A detailed examination of this group of documents makes it possible to identify specific features of their formal structure and to highlight the mechanisms of information exchange between interdependent branches of authority in the Hetmanate period. **Methods.** The research is based on a combination of general scholarly and specialized methods, including historical-typological, structural-functional, comparative, and source-critical analysis. The application of document studies methodology allowed for the clarification of the internal structure of document forms, their content organization, and the communicative functions performed by accounting and statistical records produced by regimental and company chanceries. **Results.** It has been established that accounting and statistical documents – such as registers, lists, computational records, oath and record books, census books, and revisions – served not only statistical and fiscal purposes but also fulfilled an important communicative function by facilitating information flows between different levels of authority. Their significance for the personalization of Cossack company units and for the reconstruction of the social structure of the population has been analyzed. The study demonstrates that these documents constitute a unique source base that enables the tracing of transformations in administrative practices under the influence of the imperial policies of the Russian state. **Conclusions.** Regimental and company-level accounting and statistical documents represent a valuable source for the study of official communication, administrative traditions, and the socio-economic development of the Hetmanate. Owing to their multifunctional nature, these texts inform, regulate, identify, and contribute to the formation of historical memory. Their analysis provides deeper insight into the functioning of the Ukrainian administrative system and its transformation under colonial Russian influence, particularly given that the subsequent development of record-keeping practices in Ukraine occurred within the framework of their unification with the administrative standards of the Russian Empire.

Keywords: record-keeping, company chanceries, administrative documentation, historical document studies, registers, revisions.

ПОЛКОВО-СОТЕННІ ОБЛІКОВО-СТАТИСТИЧНІ ДОКУМЕНТИ В СИСТЕМІ ДІЛОВОЇ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ ГЕТЬМАНЩИНИ

Леміш Наталія Олександрівна,

*кандидат історичних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри соціально-гуманітарних дисциплін
ВП «Ніжинський агротехнічний інститут»*

*Національного університету біоресурсів
і природокористування України*

natalem@ukr.net

orcid.org/0000-0002-5124-5687

Розвідку присвячено дослідженню полково-сотенних обліково-статистичних документів як важливої складової системи ділової комунікації Гетьманщини другої половини XVII – XVIII століть. **Метою** роботи є визначення їх функціонального призначення, інформаційного потенціалу та ролі в забезпеченні управлінської взаємодії між адміністративними структурами козацької держави. Адже такий опис документів дозволяє показати особливості їх оформлення, наголосити на специфіці технології



обміну інформацією між взаємозалежними гілками влади періоду Гетьманщини. **Методи.** У дослідженні використано комплекс загальнонаукових і спеціальних методів, зокрема історико-типологічний, структурно-функціональний, порівняльний та джерелознавчий аналіз. Застосування методів документознавчого аналізу дало змогу з'ясувати особливості побудови формуляру, змісту та комунікативних функцій обліково-статистичних документів полково-сотенних канцелярій. **Результати.** Установлено, що обліково-статистичні документи (реєстри, списки, компути, присяжні або записні, переписні книги, ревізії) виконували не лише обліково-статистичну, а й комунікативну функцію, забезпечуючи обмін інформацією між різними рівнями влади. Проаналізовано їх значення для персоналізації козацьких сотенних утворень та реконструкції соціальної структури населення. Доведено, що обліково-статистичні документи унікальним джерелом, яке дозволяє простежити трансформацію адміністративних практик у контексті імперської політики Російської держави. **Висновки.** Полково-сотенні обліково-статистичні документи становлять важливе джерело для вивчення ділової комунікації, управлінських традицій та соціально-економічного розвитку Гетьманщини. Вони є багатофункціональними комунікативними текстами, тому що інформують, регулюють, ідентифікують та формують історичну пам'ять на сьогодні. Їх аналіз сприяє глибшому розумінню механізмів функціонування української адміністративної системи та її змін в умовах колоніального російського впливу, адже подальший розвиток діловодства в Україні відбувався в умовах уніфікації з діловодством Російської імперії.

Ключові слова: діловодство, сотенні канцелярії, адміністративна документація, історичне документознавство, реєстри, ревізії.

1. Introduction

Currently, the relevance of research into the accounting and statistical documentation of administrative institutions of the Hetmanate era is determined by the growing demand for genealogical, historical, records management, and archeographic knowledge. The second half of the 17th century became a period decisive for the state-building development of our country. It was then that a unique Ukrainian system of administrative management, which had its own record-keeping traditions, was formed. These traditions include linguistic features and writing styles that were gradually displaced by the Russian form of record-keeping and the imperial administrative bureaucratic system as a whole, which completely replaced the Hetmanate order by the end of the 18th century (Lemish, 2013: 33). Thus, among the large corpus of documents of the analyzed era, one should mention the accounting and statistical forms through which a formalized exchange of information between company, regimental, and central institutions was implemented. The communicative value of these sources lies in the fixation of social roles, the legal status of persons, and the results of managerial decisions, which allows for tracing the mechanisms of information control, administrative accountability, and the transformation of business communication under conditions of the gradual restriction of the Hetmanate's autonomy. **Problem Statement.** The materials of company chancelleries are unique sources for studying local management in Left-Bank Ukraine during the Hetmanate era. After the liquidation of the company-regimental system (1781), the transformation of Cossack regiments, and the introduction of governorates (1780–1783), the system of state administration of the Russian Empire was gradually established in Ukrainian lands. The development of record-keeping in Ukraine took place under conditions of further unification with the record-keeping of the Russian Empire. **The aim of the work** is a comprehensive study of the species composition, informational potential, and communicative functions of the regimental-company accounting and statistical documentation of the Hetmanate of the

second half of the 17th – 18th centuries, as well as the clarification of the role of these documents in ensuring managerial interaction and the transformation of administrative practices under conditions of imperial unification. **The source base** of the research consists of three groups of sources: accounting and statistical documents that have been preserved, identified, and researched – *komputy*, registers, oath or record books, census books, revisions; archival documents that have been published from the 19th century to the present. It should be noted that such types of documents have been preserved only partially, so currently the publication of such archival sources is very valuable for further research. An important place is occupied by source-study research (works of P. Klymenko, O. Lazarevskyi, V. Romanovskiy), which in the context of this study are considered as secondary sources. They not only introduce unique archival data into scientific circulation but also act as an object of analysis as results of scientific communication and interpretation of the administrative heritage of the Hetmanate.

A special role in the system of scientific communication is played by archeographic publications and analytical studies prepared at the M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. It is this institution that provides the modern methodological base for processing arrays of Cossack documentation. The informational potential of such sources, and the problems of using accounting and statistical materials in genealogical research, are characterized in the scientific work of N. V. Lobko (Lobko, 2008). V. V. Kryvosheia investigates the personal composition of the officers (*starshyna*) of the Cossack state on the basis of revisions and registers (Kryvosheia, 2008: 9). P. Klymenko researched 76 archival originals of regimental registers for 1712–1764 (Klymenko, 1930). The researcher was one of the first to propose considering *komputy* and revisions not as static lists, but as dynamic objects, analyzing the conditions of their creation, movement in the process of communication between chancelleries, and methods of preservation. His approach allows for interpreting

the document as a product of the functioning of a state institution (Klymenko, 1930: 12). S. Horobets found and published, while maintaining the rules of text transmission of Cyrillic documents of the 16th – 18th centuries by a popular science method, new revisions of the first half of the 18th century, emphasizing the evolution of the informativeness of sources: from dry lists to meaningful revisions of the middle of the 18th century, which already contained expanded data on various strata of the population and social infrastructure (Horobets: 2008).

2. Typological Analysis of Accounting and Statistical Documents

The regimental-company system combined military, administrative, and judicial power and was the key foundation of the Hetmanate's statehood. Researchers emphasize that the understanding of its functioning relies primarily on a diverse complex of documents from the regimental, company, and General Military Chancelleries. In the second half of the 17th century, regiments and companies became not only military but also administrative-territorial units that ensured Cossack self-government with elected regimental and company administrations (Dankevych, 2022). For the effective management of expenses, material, and human resources during the Hetmanate era, typical forms of accounting and statistical documents were developed, among which were “oath books” (*prysyazhni knyhy*), “census books” (*perepysni knyhy*), “komputy”, “revisions”, “registers” (*reistry*), etc. The purpose of creating these documents was to ensure systematic accounting and control over the companies – the administrative units of the Hetmanate. These accounting and statistical documents helped the imperial authorities exercise control over land distribution, tax collection, record-keeping, the study of socio-economic indicators, etc.

The studied documents provide grounds to suggest that unified forms and procedures for creating such documents did not exist until the first half of the 18th century; their unification occurred primarily at the level of chancellery practice rather than through codified rules. As S. Horobets notes, the informativeness of these types changed by the middle of the 18th century. For example, each subsequent revision became increasingly substantive: information was added about sub-neighbors (*pidsusidky*) and craftsmen; from 1739, registers of residential, visiting, and tavern yards of the Cossack officers (*starshyna*), priestly yards, schools, and hospitals are known (Horobets, 2008: 12–13).

It should be noted that initially, the term “komput” was used to denote the census of Cossack households and Cossacks as military men. *Komputy* were nominal registers of the Cossacks of a regiment, which were always the primary documents that enabled state structures to know the size of the Cossack army and,

accordingly, count on its participation in any events. According to this document, pay was issued to Cossacks for service, and certain estate privileges were granted (Klymenko, 1930).

Of scientific interest is the study by P. Klymenko on the professional-estate variability of the Ukrainian people during the time of the Hetman government. The researcher developed a plan for studying *komputy* as a specific type of accounting and statistical documentation. In his concept, he emphasized the necessity of the comprehensive involvement of registers, revisions, census and oath books, and also analyzed the conditions of their creation, movement in the process of communication, and methods of preservation (Klymenko, 1930). The author, for example, provides information that the Konotop company of the Nizhyn regiment was included in the revision of 1723, where parish records were entered for the first time (Klymenko, 1930).

Gradually, from 1726, the term *komputy* was displaced by the more general Russified term “revision” (from Lat. *revisio* – review). However, the system of All-Russian documents was officially established in Left-Bank Ukraine from 1781 – the time of the introduction of governorates (On the establishment of the Chernihiv governorate, 1830: 247). Revisions were compiled in company chancelleries, which were headed by clerks (*pysari*). Regimental and company clerks, company ensigns (*khорunzhi*), clerks of city courts, and children of priests became company clerks. In the second half of the 17th century, a category of employees – company clerks – was introduced in some large companies. The company chancelleries, like the entire regimental system, were liquidated starting from 1781 (On the establishment of the Chernihiv governorate, 1830: 247). The consistent displacement of the Ukrainian language from official record-keeping and the final introduction of the administrative-territorial management of the Russian Empire with governorates on Ukrainian lands undoubtedly affected the design of business documentation as early as the middle of the 18th century.

“Forms” (for revisions, reports, registers, etc.) were often sent from the Little Russian Collegium or the Chancellery of Ministerial Rule, although some were compiled in the Hetman-officer chancelleries. These documents have survived only partially. Currently, the largest number of them is stored in the Russian Central State Archive in Moscow and the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv (Butych, 2007).

Let us focus on the analysis of the specified types of accounting and statistical documentation of the Hetmanate era – oath and census books, registers, revisions. Compared to other sources of this orientation, “registers” are distinguished by the greatest completeness and high reliability (Kryvosheia, 1999: 12). “The Register of the Zaporozhian Host (The Zboriv

Register of 1649) is a unique monument of Ukrainian accounting and statistical documentation of the mid-17th century (Register of the Zaporozhian Host of 1649, 1995). The document was compiled in 1649 by the government of Bohdan Khmelnytskyi. Currently, the original of the register is inaccessible for direct scientific research, as it is kept in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts in the form of a manuscript book. This document was first discovered by O. Bodianskyi in Warsaw in the private collection of a Russian general, privy councilor, and senator of the Warsaw Department, A. Storozhenko (a Ukrainian from the Poltava region by origin). The scientific processing and the first publication of the monument were carried out by O. Bodianskyi in 1874 (Register of the entire Zaporozhian Host after the Zboriv Treaty with the Polish King John Casimir..., 1875: 1). A second academic edition of this "Register..." was published in 1995 through the efforts of the M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. The monument was published based on the original with a foreword by F. Shevchenko and an introduction by the compilers O. Todiychuk and V. Strashko (Register of the Zaporozhian Host of 1649, 1995). The publication contains, in particular, nominal lists of Cossacks in the "column" (*stovbtseva*) form traditional for the chancellery practice of that time.

"Oath or record books of 1654" have also come down to our time (Oath books of 1654. Bila Tserkva and Nizhyn regiments, 2003), the creation of which was directly related to the decision of the Pereiaslav Council on the conclusion of a Russian-Ukrainian military-political alliance. According to these decisions, the Cossacks and burghers of the Hetmanate were to swear allegiance to Tsar Alexei I. Of the 18 oath books, only two have survived – those of the Bila Tserkva and Nizhyn regiments, the originals of which are kept in Russian archival institutions. A modern scientific reprint of these sources was carried out in 2003 under the editorship of Yu. Mytskyk and M. Kravets (Oath books of 1654. Bila Tserkva and Nizhyn regiments, 2003). The "Oath Book of the Nizhyn Regiment" is a significant document in terms of volume (687 sheets, format 21 × 15.3 cm), compiled by the "stolnik" Dmitriev and the clerk Fedorov. When using this source in records management studies, it is necessary to take into account the specifics of its creation: the materials were recorded by representatives of the Moscow government, who, in accordance with established practice, changed Ukrainian surnames, "Russifying" them. Numerous examples of such transformations are recorded in the text: "Ivanenko" (Ivanovych, Ivaniuk, Ivanchenko, etc.) became "Ivanov"; "Petrenko" (Petrovych, Petrychenko, etc.) – "Petrov" (Oath books of 1654. Bila Tserkva and Nizhyn regiments, 2003: 27). Other distortions caused by the Moscow scribes' lack of understanding of the Ukrainian

language were also permitted, in particular "Dutka" instead of "Dudka" (Oath books of 1654. Bila Tserkva and Nizhyn regiments, 2003: 131); the name of the village Vyryvka was recorded as "Verevka" (Oath books of 1654. Bila Tserkva and Nizhyn regiments, 2003: 10). These materials organically belong to a broader complex of statistical and accounting sources used for the reconstruction of social history and the identification of communication methods of the administrative institutions of the Hetmanate era.

A significant source for researching the methods of business communication between the administrative institutions of the Ukrainian and Moscow governments is the "Census Book of 1666," compiled and published in Kyiv in 1900 by O. Lazarevskyi (Little Russian Census Books of 1666, 1900). Census books also began to be compiled after the arrival of Moscow census-takers in Ukrainian lands in 1665 with government orders to register the entire commoner (*pospolyta*) population. The Cossacks (*tovarystvo*) remained outside the census, which testifies to the initial stage of the formation of fiscal-accounting practices of the Russian administration (Little Russian Census Books of 1666, 1900: 104). The mentioned sources vividly reflect the level of material well-being of the local population as of the mid-17th century. At the same time, the documents consistently maintain the record-keeping tradition of the "column" form.

The work on organizing and publishing the "Census Books of 1666" was continued by V. Romanovskyi, who in 1933 began publishing materials of the Kyiv, Nizhyn, and Baturyn regiments (Census Books of 1666, 1933). The "Starodub Census Book," according to his testimony, remained unprocessed and was to be published later together with a full archeographic description of all the census books of 1666; however, this plan was not realized. Explaining the reasons for the publication of these books, the researcher noted: "the publication is intended for those who would like to shed light on the social history of Ukraine. Based on this material, one can study the direction of Moscow's colonial policy toward Ukraine" (Census Books of 1666, 1933: 10). After the works of V. Romanovskyi, no source-study research of a similar thematic focus and scale appeared during the Soviet period. Only in 1995, thanks to the activities of the M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, was a reprint of the "Register of the Zaporozhian Host of 1649" published, continuing the scientific tradition initiated by O. Bodianskyi (Register of the Zaporozhian Host of 1649, 1995).

Thus, oath and census books, registers, and revisions were of decisive importance for the functioning of the Cossack state. For the Hetmanate itself, these documents were an instrument for legitimizing the company-regimental system and a means of ensuring defense capability, as they recorded the mobilization

resource and the estate status of the Cossacks. Revisions acted as a guarantor of preserving the socio-legal space of Ukrainian autonomy, as land ownership rights and exemption from all-imperial duties were confirmed through accounting mechanisms.

3. Communicative Functions of Accounting and Statistical Documents

Accounting and statistical documents of the Hetmanate (registers, *komputy*, revisions, descriptions) performed not only an applied administrative role but also represented in writing a complex system of communicative functions aimed at interaction between the authorities, society, and territorial structures, while also serving as a valuable source for genealogical reconstruction. In practice, such a communicative link had a vertical form: from the General Military Chancellery to the regimental and company chancelleries. The duties of creating accounting and statistical documents were assigned to the regimental chancelleries and regimental clerks (*pysari*). For example, Cossack *komputy*, which held the significance of legal acts, were managed in the regiments by the adjutants (*osavuly*) (Business Documentation of the Hetmanate of the 18th Century, 1993: 11). At the interstate level, relations between the Tsarist government and Left-Bank Ukraine were carried out through the Ambassadorial Office (*Posolsky Prikaz*), which formally left Ukrainian institutions within the control of the Moscow government. From 1662, with the creation of the Little Russian Office (*Malorossiyskiy Prikaz*), there was an intensification of direct administrative dependence, as communication between the Hetmanate and the Tsarist authority began to be conducted through a specialized imperial body. The final establishment of subordination occurred in 1722 with the founding of the Little Russian Collegium under the reform of Peter I, which effectively institutionalized the loss of autonomy of Ukrainian administrative institutions and moved them into a regime of centralized imperial control (Business Documentation of the Hetmanate of the 18th Century, 1993: 14). Indicative in this context is the turn at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century to the practice of publishing and scientifically comprehending the registers of the Hetmanate era.

One of the first to publish registers of the Hetmanate era was O. Lazarevskyi, who in 1892 published the oldest preserved census of Cossacks – “Description of the Konotop Company of 1711” in 1892: “General Investigation of the Estates of the Chernihiv Regiment” and “Description of the Konotop Company of 1711” (*Chernigovskiya Gubernskiya Vedomosti*) (Description of the Konotop Company of 1711, 1892: 5). The author analyzes the upper and middle strata of the Ukrainian “population in the first quarter of the 18th century” (Description of the Konotop Company of 1711, 1892: 4). Lazarevskyi published the second volume of “Description of Old Little Russia,” dedicated

to the Nizhyn regiment, in Kyiv in 1893 (Description of Old Little Russia, 1888–1893). The sources and methods of analysis were the same as in the first volume, only instead of the data from the 1723 revision, the data from the 1736 revision were presented. Relying on the material of this description-register, O. Lazarevskyi published the work “Information on the Oldest Members of the Lazarevskyi Family” (Lazarevskyi, 1927). In this work, the author analyzes his genealogy over 200 years. The researcher begins the description of the family with the surname Lazarenko (Vasyl'ii and Yusko) from the 1711 register, and further relies on information from the 1736 register, which was not published by anyone during O. Lazarevskyi's lifetime. We thus see that the author was also familiar with another register of the Konotop company from 1736. Currently, at the end of 2022, this register was published and supplemented with revisions from subsequent years with a foreword by O. Tryhub – “Revisions of the Konotop Company of the 30s–40s of the 18th Century” (Revisions of the Konotop Company of the 30s–40s of the 18th Century, 2022). Using the 1711 register and the register of 1736, which was unpublished at that time, the researcher reconstructs his own genealogy over two centuries. O. Lazarevskyi mentions Levko Lazarenko in his study “Information on the Oldest Members of the Lazarevskyi Family”; however, in the 2022 edition of “Revisions...”, he and his relatives have the surname Lazorenko, which provides grounds to assert that the correct form is still Lazarenko, as the author himself notes (Revisions of the Konotop Company of the 30s–40s of the 18th Century, 2022: 451). However, O. Lazarevskyi's information about Levko is limited to 1736, whereas according to the modern edition of the registers, we clearly trace Levko as a “destitute” (*nishchetnyi*) Cossack, burgher, and commoner (*pospolytyi*) further – in 1737, 1738, 1745, and 1747. Information about the family after 1736 in Lazarevskyi's work continues only from 1861 (Lazarevskyi, 1927). In this case, the register goes beyond the limits of an administrative document and transforms into a means of personal and familial communication with the past, where statistical data acquire biographical and symbolic dimensions. We can assume that at the time of writing the work on his genealogy, O. Lazarevskyi did not have the opportunity to familiarize himself with these registers; otherwise, he would have noted this time period and, possibly, published these registers as well. The very fact of the publication of the registers testifies to O. Lazarevskyi's understanding of their communicative value: the register acts not only as a source of quantitative information but also as a text through which it is possible to reconstruct the social roles, hierarchies, and mechanisms of self-identification of the Ukrainian population.

Thus, the communicative nature of these documents manifests at three levels: the state (managerial

vertical), the scientific (source-study heritage and its interpretation by researchers), and the personal (genealogical memory). This confirms the status of accounting and statistical materials as multifunctional communicative texts that retain their relevance beyond the historical era of their creation.

4. Conclusions

The study of accounting and statistical documentation of the Hetmanate era makes it possible to reconstruct the social structure, population size, property status, and dynamics of changes within the Cossack and commoner (*pospolytyi*) milieus, as well as to trace the features of business communications between military-administrative institutions. It has been established that registers, *komputy*, and revisions functioned as complex communicative channels that ensured not only statistical accounting but also the stability of managerial links between the General Military Chancellery and local administrative structures. At the same time, the introduction of the norms and forms of record-keeping of the Russian imperial authorities had a negative impact on the process of compiling registers and *komputy*: local traditions of chancellery writing were gradually leveled, the structure of documents was unified, and the Ukrainian language was

displaced from official use, which affected the content, terminology, and representativeness of accounting and statistical materials. It is proved that the process of imperial unification of record-keeping led to the transformation of accounting and statistical forms from instruments of Cossack self-government into means of centralized control of the Russian state. For the Hetmanate itself, these documents were a means of survival and self-government (army, taxes, rights), whereas for the empire, they became a means of control and the liquidation of autonomy. The analysis of the corpus of registers used and published by O. Lazarevskyi and supplemented by modern archeographic editions allows for the consideration of the accounting and statistical documents of the Hetmanate as multi-level communicative texts. These act not only as a source of quantitative data but also as a specific space of personal and familial communication, where a statistical record acquires an identification and memorial dimension, allowing for the reconstruction of individual fates against the backdrop of global administrative changes. They simultaneously perform informational, identificational, memorial, and scholarly-interpretative functions, which makes them extremely promising for further linguistic-stylistic and discursive research.

Bibliography:

1. Бутич І. Л. Компуті. Енциклопедія історії України : у 10 т. Т. 4 : Ка–Ком / редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін. ; НАН України, Ін-т історії України. Київ : Наук. думка, 2007. URL: <http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Komputy> (дата звернення: 05.11.2025).
2. Горобець С. Невідомий фрагмент Ревізії Чернігівського полку 1732 року. Сіверянський літопис. 2008. № 4. С. 12–40. URL: <https://nasplib.isofts.kiev.ua/handle/123456789/46327> (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
3. Данькевич В. Г. Особливості формування матеріальної та фінансової основи місцевого самоврядування Лівобережної України в другій половині XVII ст. Вісник аграрної історії. 2022. № 39–42. С. 40–51. URL: <https://doi.org/10.31392/VAH-2022.39-42.03>.
4. Ділова документація Гетьманщини XVIII ст. / упоряд. В. Горобець. Київ, 1993. 392 с.
5. Клименко П. Компуті та ревізії XVII–XVIII ст. Український археографічний збірник. 1930. № 3. С. 56–241.
6. Кривошея В. В. Козацька еліта Гетьманщини. Київ : ІПіЕНД ім. І. Ф. Кураса НАН України, 2008. 452 с.
7. Кривошея І. І. Ревізії та реєстри XVIII ст. як джерело з історії Чернігівського полку. Україна на порозі XXI століття: актуальні питання історії : зб. наук. пр. Київ : Стило, 1999. С. 56–62.
8. Лазаревский О. Сведения о старейших членах рода Лазаревских. Український археографічний збірник. 1927. Т. 2. С. 1–18. URL: http://history.org.ua/LiberUA/UkrArkhZb2_1927/UkrArkhZb2_1927.pdf (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
9. Леміш Н. О. Організація діловодства в адміністративних установах Лівобережної України першої половини XIX ст. : монографія. Київ : ДІЯ, 2013. 176 с.
10. Лобко Н. В. Особливості використання обліково-статистичних документів XVI – початку XVIII ст. при проведенні генеалогічних досліджень. Сумський історико-архівний журнал. 2008. № IV–V. С. 78–85. URL: <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/431> (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
11. Малороссийские переписные книги 1666 года / с послесл. Ал. Лазаревского. Киев : Тип. Имп. ун-та Св. Владимира, 1900. Т. 2. 109 с. URL: https://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=ukr0004435 (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
12. Об учреждении Черниговского наместничества : указ от 16 сентября 1781 г. Полное собрание законов Российской империи. Собр. 1-е. СПб., 1830. Т. 21, № 15229. С. 247.

13. Описание старой Малороссии. Материалы для истории заселения, землевладения и управления : в 3 т. / Ал. Лазаревский. Киев : Тип. К. Н. Милевского, 1888–1893. URL: https://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=ukr0002223 (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
14. Опись Конопотской сотни 1711 г. / изд. А. Лазаревского. Чернигов, 1892. 30 с. URL: <https://www.calameo.com/read/002055968c27f2aed447f> (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
15. Переписні книги 1666 року / за ред. О. Романовського. Київ, 1933. 448 с. URL: <https://file.lib.in.ua/pdf/romanovskyi-viktor-pererupsni-knyhy-1666-roku-1933.pdf> (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
16. Присяжні книги 1654 р. Білоцерківський та Ніжинський полки / упоряд. Ю. Мицик, М. Кравець. Київ : [б. в.], 2003. 349 с. URL: http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=ukr0004111 (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
17. Ревізії Конопотської сотні 30–40-х років XVIII ст. / упоряд. О. Тригуб. Київ : КЛІО, 2022. 494 с.
18. Реестра всего Войска Запорожскаго послѣ Зборовскаго договора с королем польским Яном Казимиром... / изд. О. М. Бодянским. Москва, 1875. 337 с. URL: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Bodianskyi_Yosyp/Reestra_vseho_Voiska_Zaporozhskaha_posl_Zborovskaha_dohovora_ros.pdf (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).
19. Реєстр Війська Запорозького 1649 року / упоряд. О. В. Тодійчук (гол. упоряд.), В. В. Страшко, П. І. Осташ, Р. В. Майборода ; Археографічна комісія, Ін-т української археографії, Ін-т історії України. Київ : Наук. думка, 1995. 592 с. URL: <https://archive.org/details/reiestrviiska1649/page/89/mode/2up> (дата звернення: 20.02.2026).

References:

1. Butych, I. L. (2007). Komputy [Computations]. In V. A. Smolii (Ed.), *Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy: T. 4: Ka–Kom* [Encyclopedia of the History of Ukraine: Vol. 4: Ka–Kom]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. <http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Komputy> (last accessed 05.11.2025) [in Ukrainian].
2. Horobets, S. (2008). Nevidomyi frahment Revizii Chernihivskoho polku 1732 roku [Unknown fragment of the 1732 revision of the Chernihiv Regiment]. *Siverianskyi litopys*, No. 4, 12–40. <https://nasplib.isofts.kiev.ua/handle/123456789/46327> (last accessed 20.02.2026) [in Ukrainian].
3. Dankevych, V. H. (2022). Osoblyvosti formuvannia materialnoi ta finansovoi osnovy mistsevoho samovriaduvannia Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy v druhii polovyni XVII st. [Peculiarities of the formation of the material and financial basis of local self-government of Left-Bank Ukraine in the second half of the 17th century]. *Visnyk ahrarnoi istorii*, No. 39–42, 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.31392/VAH-2022.39-42.03> [in Ukrainian].
4. Horobets, V. (1993). Dilova dokumentatsiia Hetmanshchyny XVIII st. [Administrative documentation of the Hetmanate of the 18th century]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
5. Klymenko, P. (1930). Komputy ta revizii XVII–XVIII st. [Computations and revisions of the 17th–18th centuries]. *Ukrainskyi arkhografichnyi zbirnyk*, No. 3, 56–241. [in Ukrainian].
6. Kryvosheia, V. V. (2008). Kozatska elita Hetmanshchyny [Cossack elite of the Hetmanate]. Kyiv: IPiEND imeni I. F. Kurasa NAN Ukrainy. [in Ukrainian].
7. Kryvosheia, I. I. (1999). Revizii ta reiestry XVIII st. yak dzherelo z istorii Chernihivskoho polku [Revisions and registers of the 18th century as a source for the history of the Chernihiv Regiment]. In *Ukraina na porozhi XXI stolittia: Aktualni pytannia istorii* [Ukraine on the threshold of the 21st century: Current issues of history] (pp. 56–62). Kyiv: Stylos. [in Ukrainian].
8. Lazarevskii, O. (1927). Svedeniia o stareishikh chlenakh roda Lazarevskikh [Information about the oldest members of the Lazarevsky family]. *Ukrainskyi arkhografichnyi zbirnyk*, Vol. 2, 1–18. http://history.org.ua/LiberUA/UkrArkhZb2_1927/UkrArkhZb2_1927.pdf (last accessed 20.02.2026) [in russian].
9. Lemish, N. O. (2013). Orhanizatsiia dilovodstva v administratyvnykh ustanovakh Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy pershoi polovyny XIX st. [Organization of record keeping in administrative institutions of Left-Bank Ukraine in the first half of the 19th century]. Kyiv: DIIa. [in Ukrainian].
10. Lobko, N. V. (2008). Osoblyvosti vykorystannia oblikovo-statystychnykh dokumentiv XVI – pochatku XVIII st. pry provedenni henealohichnykh doslidzhen [Peculiarities of using accounting and statistical documents of the 16th – early 18th centuries in genealogical research]. *Sumskyi istoryko-arkhivnyi zhurnal*, No. IV–V, 78–85. <http://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/431> (last accessed 20.02.2026) [in Ukrainian].
11. Lazarevskii, A. (1900). Malorossiiskie perepisnye knigi 1666 goda (Vol. 2) [Little Russian census books of 1666]. Kyiv: Tipografiia Imperatorskogo Universiteta Sv. Vladimira. https://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=ukr0004435 (last accessed 20.02.2026) [in russian].

12. Ob uchrezhdenii Chernigovskogo namestnichestva: Ukaz ot 16 sentiabria 1781 g. (1830). [On the establishment of the Chernihiv vicegerency: Decree of September 16, 1781]. In Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii (1st ed., Vol. 21, No. 15229, p. 247). Saint Petersburg. [in russian].
13. Lazarevskii, A. (1888–1893). Opisanie staroi Malorossii: Materialy dlia istorii zaseleniia, zemlevladeniia i upravleniia (Vols. 1–3) [Description of Old Little Russia: Materials for the history of settlement, landownership, and administration]. Kyiv: Tipografia K. N. Milevskogo. https://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=ukr0002223 (last accessed 20.02.2026) [in Russian].
14. Lazarevskii, A. (1892). Opis Konotopskoi sotni 1711 g. [Description of the Konotop sotnia of 1711]. Chernihiv. [in russian].
15. Romanovskiy, O. (1933). Perepysni knyhy 1666 roku [Census books of 1666]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
16. Mytsyk, Yu., & Kravets, M. (2003). Prysiazhni knyhy 1654 r.: Bilotserkivskiyi ta Nizhynskiyi polky [Oath books of 1654: Bila Tserkva and Nizhyn Regiments]. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
17. Tryhub, O. (2022). Revizii Konotopskoi sotni 30–40-kh rokiv XVIII st. [Revisions of the Konotop sotnia of the 1730s–1740s]. Kyiv: KLIO. [in Ukrainian].
18. Bodianskii, O. M. (1875). Reestra vsego Voiska Zaporozhskago posle Zborovskago dogovora s korolem polskim Ianom Kazimirom, sostavlennye 1649 goda, oktiabria 16 dnia [Register of the entire Zaporozhian Host after the Treaty of Zboriv with King Jan II Casimir of Poland, compiled October 16, 1649]. moscow. [in russian].
19. Todiichuk, O. V., Strashko, V. V., Ostash, P. I., & Maiboroda, R. V. (1995). Reiestr Viiska Zaporozkoho 1649 roku [Register of the Zaporozhian Host of 1649]. Kyiv: Naukova dumka. <https://archive.org/details/reiestrviiska1649/page/89/mode/2up> (last accessed 20.02.2026) [in Ukrainian].

Date of initial submission: 23.02.2026

Date of acceptance after peer review: 13.03.2026

Publication date: 07.04.2026

UDC 94:316.647.6:323.281(477)“1956/1965”

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2026-53-3>

THE KGB'S STRUGGLE AGAINST THE UKRAINIAN SIXTIES IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 1960S

Paska Bohdan Valeriiovych,
*Candidate of Historical Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department of History
of Ukraine and Methods of Teaching History
Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University
bohdan.paska@pnu.edu.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-5452-5254*

The purpose of the article is a comprehensive analysis of the forms, methods, and mechanisms of the KGB's struggle against the Ukrainian Sixties in the first half of the 1960s, with an explanation of the evolution of the intelligence, operational, and preventive activities of the special service and the preparation of the groundwork for further repressive actions. **The methodological basis** of the article was the principles of objectivity, historicism, comprehensiveness, continuity, as well as a complex of special-historical and general scientific methods. The work used methods of analysis and synthesis, retrospective, problem-chronological, and the method of comparison and comparison of information from various sources. **Results and conclusions.** In the first half of the 1960s, the KGB developed specific tactics against the sixties, which differed from practices against underground organizations: instead of mass arrests, agent-operational measures, prevention and ideological pressure dominated. Already in the late 1950s, the foundation of systemic control was laid – an extensive agent network, mass “preventive conversations”, recruitment attempts and interrogations testified to the early institutional reaction of the penal authorities to the activation of the cultural movement. In 1963–1964, pressure took on more pronounced forms: along with public ideological campaigns, agent operations were deployed; in particular, the case of the group development “88” was opened. The totality of the recorded measures indicates a transition from fragmentary supervision to systematic preparation of a large-scale repressive action, implemented as early as 1965. The intensification of preventive work in the mid-1960s indicates that the KGB sought not only to control, but also to intercept the semantic leadership among the Sixties. It is significant that even many hours of conversations and coercion to “repent” did not guarantee the cessation of the Sixties' activity, which led to the further radicalization of the actions of the special services. Active “study” of regional cells and an attempt to connect the Sixties with the OUN underground completed the formation of the narrative about the “heirs of the nationalists”, which became the basis for subsequent arrests. In the first half of the 1960s, an institutional, agentic, and propaganda infrastructure was created to combat the sixties, which determined the nature of the repressive policy of the middle and second half of the decade.

Keywords: *Ukrainian Sixties movement, Committee for State Security (KGB), political repressions, dissident movement, Soviet regime, preventive conversations, intelligence and operational work.*

БОРОТЬБА КДБ ПРОТИ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ШІСТДЕСЯТНИКІВ У ПЕРШІЙ ПОЛОВИНІ 1960-Х РР.

Паска Богдан Валерійович,
*кандидат історичних наук,
доцент кафедри історії України і методики
викладання історії
Прикарпатського національного університету
імені Василя Стефаника
bohdan.paska@pnu.edu.ua
orcid.org/0000-0002-5452-5254*

Метою статті є комплексний аналіз форм, методів і механізмів боротьби Комітету державної безпеки (КДБ) проти українських шістдесятників у першій половині 1960-х рр., із з'ясуванням еволюції агентурно-оперативної та профілактичної діяльності спецслужби й підготовки підґрунтя для подальших репресивних акцій. **Методологічною основою** статті виступили принципи об'єктивності, історизму, всебічності, наступності, а також комплекс спеціально-історичних і загальнонаукових методів. У роботі використано методи аналізу та синтезу, ретроспективний, проблемно-хронологічний, метод порівняння та зіставлення інформації з різних джерел. **Результати та висновки.** У першій половині 1960-х рр. КДБ виробив щодо шістдесятників специфічну тактику, що відрізнялася від практик проти підпільних організацій: замість масових арештів домінували агентурно-оперативні заходи, профілактика та ідеологічний тиск. Уже наприкінці 1950-х рр. було закладено основу системного



контролю – розгалужена агентурна мережа, масові «профілактичні бесіди», спроби вербування та допити засвідчили досить швидку реакцію каральних органів на активізацію культурного руху. У 1963–1964 рр. тиск набув виразніших форм: поряд із публічними ідеологічними кампаніями було розгорнуто агентурні операції, зокрема заведено справу групової розробки «88». Сукупність зафіксованих заходів свідчить про перехід від фрагментарного нагляду до системної підготовки масштабної репресивної акції, реалізованої вже 1965 р. Посилення профілактичної роботи у середині 1960-х рр. свідчить про те, що КДБ прагнув не тільки контролювати, а й перехопити смислове лідерство в середовищі шістдесятників. Показово, що навіть багатогодинні бесіди й примус до «каяття» не гарантували припинення активності шістдесятників, що зумовило подальшу радикалізацію дій спецслужби. Активне «вивчення» регіональних осередків і спроба пов'язати шістдесятників із оунівським підпіллям завершили формування нарративу про «спадкоємців націоналістів», який став підґрунтям для наступних арештів. У першій половині 1960-х рр. було створено інституційну, агентурну та пропагандистську інфраструктуру боротьби з шістдесятниками, що визначила характер репресивної політики середини і другої половини десятиліття.

Ключові слова: український шістдесятницький рух, Комітет державної безпеки (КДБ), політичні репресії, дисидентський рух, радянський режим, профілактичні бесіди, агентурно-оперативна робота.

1. Introduction

Problem statement. In the first half of the 1960s, a young generation of intellectuals formed in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (Ukrainian SSR), which went down in history as the Sixties. They were the bearers of new cultural and social orientations associated with the partial liberalization of the “thaw” period. Their activities included literature, art, science, human rights initiatives, and public speeches in defense of the Ukrainian language and culture. At the same time, the intensification of national and cultural life caused concern among the party and state leadership, which viewed these processes as a potential threat to the ideological monopoly. A special role in neutralizing and containing the Sixties movement was played by the Committee for State Security (KGB) under the Council of Ministers (CM) of the Ukrainian SSR, which carried out operational surveillance, preventive measures, intelligence development, and open repressive actions. However, despite the existence of individual studies, a comprehensive analysis of the mechanisms and forms of the KGB's struggle against the Sixties in the first half of the 1960s remains insufficiently systematized. This necessitates a rethinking of the aforementioned issues, taking into account new archival sources and modern methodological approaches.

The problem of the study lies in the need to clarify the relationship between the official ideological policy of the “thaw” period and the real practices of the state security agencies in relation to the Ukrainian creative and scientific intelligentsia. The study of this topic allows us to better understand the origins of the wave of repressions in the middle of the decade and the transformation of the Sixties movement into a dissident movement. Thus, the outlined topic is of great importance for understanding the nature of Soviet national policy and the mechanisms of the functioning of the repressive apparatus in conditions of limited liberalization.

Analysis of basic research. The general situation of the Ukrainian Sixties movement in the first half of the 1960s has been professionally analyzed in the works of modern researchers Heorhiy Kasyanov (Kasianov, 2019), Oles Obertas (Obertas, 2010), Yaroslav Seko (Seko, 2011), and Radomyr Mokryk (Mokryk, 2023).

The activities of regional Sixties cells in Lviv were traced by Yaroslav Seko (Seko, 2015), and in Lutsk and Ivano-Frankivsk by Bohdan Paska (Paska, 2015; Paska, 2016). The peculiarities of the functioning of the KGB in the context of its repressive activities against the national movement in the Ukrainian SSR have been traced in the studies of Anatoly Rusnachenko (Rusnachenko, 1998: 35–40), Yuriy Zaitsev (Zaitsev, 2012–2013), and Oleh Bazhan (Bazhan, 2014). However, most of the available work by scholars is based on sources of dissident or party origin, with almost no involvement in the previously classified archives of the KGB.

The basis of the source base of the article was the materials of report notes, information and special messages of the leadership of the KGB under the CM of the Ukrainian SSR to the Central Committee (CC) of the Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) from the Sectoral State Archive of the Security Service of Ukraine (SSA SSU). They included detailed reports on the ongoing repressive activities of an agent-operational, preventive and investigative-judicial nature against the Sixties. The scientific novelty of the study lies in revealing the role of the KGB in the processes of pressure by the Soviet regime on the Sixties, as well as in involving little-known documents from the archives of the special service into scientific circulation.

The purpose of the article is a comprehensive analysis of the forms, methods, and mechanisms of the KGB's struggle against the Ukrainian Sixties in the first half of the 1960s, with an explanation of the evolution of the intelligence, operational, and preventive activities of the special service and the preparation of the groundwork for further repressive actions.

2. The KGB and the Sixties at the turn of the 1950s and 1960s.

Analyzing the actions of the KGB in the 1960s and early 1970s against the Sixties environment, we can see a certain difference from the repressions against the structures of the underground movement – the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union (URSS), the Ukrainian National Committee (UNK), the Ukrainian National Party (UNP), the Ukrainian National Front (UNF), etc. If they tried to use the harshest possible methods of punishment against the underground, very

long prison terms, and in some cases even executions, then during the first half of the 1960s, open judicial punitive measures were practically not applied against the Sixties. Repressive pressure essentially grew throughout the decade and reached its peak during the general pogrom of 1972–1973. However, the special service used agent-operational and preventive methods from the very beginning of the public activity of the new generation of creative intelligentsia. Particular attention was paid to individuals who sympathized with any signs of Ukrainian national identity.

Researcher R. Mokryk points to the turn of the 1950s and 1960s as the time when many of the sixties first crossed paths with the KGB in one way or another. The poet Vasyl Stus fell “on the hook” of the local KGB agencies in Stalino (now Donetsk) back in 1957, when he was summoned for interrogation several times after speaking in Ukrainian at the opening of the monument to Taras Shevchenko. As of 1959, in Kyiv, the special service’s intelligence development along the lines of “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists” included 49 people, supervised by 109 agents. In total, the special service had more than 1,100 agents at its disposal in Kyiv; 74 new agents were recruited in 1959. Preventive interviews were conducted with 160 people in the capital during the year. Literary critic Ivan Dzyuba recalled an unsuccessful attempt by the head of the KGB ideological department, Leonid Kallash, to recruit him as an agent in 1959 (Mokryk, 2023: 136–138). In the same year, 1959, a student at Kyiv University, a young poet Ivan Drach, was summoned for questioning by the KGB, who, during a political briefing, resorted to overly harsh criticism of the Stalinists. In the spring of 1960, literary critic Yevhen Sverstyuk first became acquainted with the KGB methods. He was tried several times to persuade the authorities to give the testimony they needed during interrogations in the case of his colleague Ivan Brovko, who was accused of “bourgeois nationalism” (Mokryk, 2023: 139–141). In 1958, student Oleksandr Martynenko was subjected to preventive measures (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 944. Ark. 183), and the following year, philologist Bohdan Horyn (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 944. Ark. 177).

In December 1959, the CC of the CPU adopted a resolution “On the Status and Measures to Strengthen the Work of the State Security Bodies of the Ukrainian SSR,” which obliged the special service to “intensify work to prevent, expose, and stop hostile actions by nationalist and other anti-Soviet elements on the territory of the republic.” Punitive bodies were oriented toward the wider use of preventive methods. In July 1962, the KGB of the CM of the USSR issued a secret order “On Strengthening the Fight of State Security Bodies against Hostile Manifestations of Anti-Soviet Elements.” Detective work was to be strengthened in higher and secondary specialized educational institutions, and the intelligentsia and youth became

the objects of special attention of the special service (Kasianov, 2019: 45–46).

3. Intensification of pressure on the sixties in 1963–1964.

The government’s pressure on the Sixties environment significantly intensified in 1963–1964. Its key milestones can be considered the campaign launched by the First Secretary of the CC of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) Nikita Khrushchev to combat the so-called “formalists”, criticism of writers I. Drach, Mykola Vinhranovskyi and I. Dzyuba at a meeting of the active creative intelligentsia and ideological workers of Ukraine (April 1963), the destruction of the Shevchenko stained glass window prepared by a group of Ukrainian artists at Kyiv University (March 1964), and the coercion of I. Drach, Lina Kostenko, Vitaliy Korotych and Yevhen Hutsalo to write a publication directed against Ukrainian emigration in the Soviet official press (May 1964) (Mokryk, 2023: 354).

The KGB’s intelligence and operational work gradually intensified. In 1963, one of the key Ukrainian poets of the 1960s, V. Korotych, was recruited as a KGB agent. He appears in the special service’s documentation as agent “Yanvarsky” (Ivanenko, 2024). Approximately, in 1964, as evidenced by subsequent special service reports, the first major secret case of group operational development under the code name “88” was opened against the Ukrainian Sixties. The materials of this case have not been preserved in the KGB archives, and there are no corresponding reports addressed to the Ukrainian party or state leadership. So far, we have only been able to find a few references to this case in later documents from the 1970s (usually memos addressed to the Kremlin center), which mention 1964 as the year of the beginning of operational actions within its framework (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 1074. Ark. 99). Obviously, this case was directed against the Sixties environment, the legal wing of the Ukrainian national movement, and was eventually partially implemented in 1965 in the form of the first wave of arrests. Since there are no references to the “88” case in the materials of communication between the KGB of the Ukrainian SSR and the CC of the CPSU, it can be assumed that most of the instructions for its deployment came from Moscow itself. Probably, most of the measures of an agent-operational and preventive nature against the Sixties took place precisely within the framework of the “88” case.

Evidence of total surveillance of representatives of the Ukrainian creative intelligentsia can be considered an information message from the KGB leadership to the CC of the CPU dated October 28, 1964. Monitoring the situation after the so-called “palace coup” and the overthrow of N. Khrushchev, KGB officers recorded private conversations of Ivan Dzyuba, Taras Franko, Yuriy Nazarenko, Hryhoriy Donets, Mykyta

Shumylo, Maria Hayduchok, Mykola Hryn, in which they sharply criticized the Russification policy of the former party leader, “violations of Lenin’s national policy” in Ukraine. Some of them planned to write open letters to the new party leadership with a request to change the national policy in favor of Ukrainians (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 940. Ark. 200–206). In November 1964, KGB agents recorded a private conversation with I. Dzyuba, during which he expressed the opinion that it was necessary to prepare a document with a scientific analysis of the national policy of the Soviet regime in Ukraine and to formulate proposals for correcting the errors that, in his opinion, had occurred (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 940. Ark. 219–221). Exactly one year later, the literary critic managed to realize this idea in the form of writing a treatise “Internationalism or Russification?”

4. The struggle for the legacy of the poet Vasyl Symonenko

In the first months of 1965, the KGB was active in the struggle between the Sixties environment and the authorities for the literary heritage of the young poet V. Symonenko, who died of a serious illness in December 1963. He became a true symbol of the Sixties, and party functionaries sought to view him as an official poet who allegedly did not oppose the Soviet authorities (Kasianov, 2019: 38). On January 16, 1965, at an official evening dedicated to the 30th anniversary of the birth of V. Symonenko in the Republican House of Writers, I. Dzyuba addressed the audience with a speech. He insisted on the dominance of the poet’s work precisely by the national idea, which is connected with universal human values, and interpreted his poetry as a call for high civic activity in the context of the rise of national and political life (Obertas, 2010: 116). The penal authorities monitored the reaction of I. Dzyuba’s colleagues in the creative workshop to this event, noted the special position of certain representatives of the Ukrainian creative intelligentsia, who positively treated the literary critic’s speech as aimed at protecting Ukrainian culture, saw it as a manifestation of principle, honesty and courage. The KGB leadership reported to the Central Committee of the party about a wide discussion among writers of the possible expulsion of I. Dzyuba from the Writers’ Union of Ukraine (SPU) after his speech. Some colleagues planned to express solidarity with the critic, demonstratively declare their withdrawal from the SPU, write an appeal in his support, etc. (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 941. Ark. 110–112). In the end, the leadership decided not to resort to sharp administrative pressure on I. Dzyuba for the time being.

A few months later, the KGB again brought up the “Symonenko Question”. On March 22, 1965, the leadership of the special service reported to party leaders about the widespread distribution among the creative intelligentsia and youth of the Ukrainian

SSR in a samizdat manner of unpublished poems by V. Symonenko, as well as his diary “Okraytsi Dumok” (“The Fringes of Thought”). The fact that these materials were distributed abroad and were published in the emigre magazine “Suchasnist” (No. 1 for 1965) caused particular alarm to the punitive authorities. KGB officers actively worked to clarify the circumstances of the transfer of V. Symonenko’s works abroad. Considering the popularization of the work of the poet I. Dzyuba, the head of the republican KGB Vitaly Nikitchenko expressed the idea of instructing the leadership of the SPU to hold a conversation with the critic, to inform the latter about the attempts of “foreign nationalist centers” to use certain works of V. Symonenko for propaganda purposes against the USSR, and to recommend that he speak out against these steps of the Ukrainian emigration (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 941. Ark. 465–466).

According to the special services, the literary critic Ivan Svitlychny, who had the late poet’s archive, facilitated the dissemination of V. Symonenko’s unpublished legacy. The advice for the party leadership was as follows: “We consider it appropriate to consider the issue of transferring Symonenko’s archive for storage to the Writers’ Union of Ukraine” (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 941. Ark. 467). The authorities’ reaction was to instruct the writer M. Nehoda to write an article with a critical assessment of the fact of the dissemination of Symonenko’s works in samizdat; eventually, on April 15, his libel “Everest of meanness” was published in the newspaper “Soviet Ukraine”, in which I. Svitlychny was criticized (Kasianov, 2019: 38).

5. Strengthening the preventive work of the special services

KGB officers took serious measures to prevent open acts of resistance by the Ukrainian intelligentsia of the Sixties against the national policy of the Soviet regime. At the end of April 1965, the special service received information that Vasyl Lobko, an engineer at the Kyiv Institute of Hydrology and Hydraulic Engineering, had developed and intended to disseminate in the capital of the Ukrainian SSR the program and charter of the “Society for Promoting the Spread of the Ukrainian Language (Ukrainization of Ukraine)”. On April 27, “in order to prevent provocation”, operatives conducted a preventive conversation with him at his workplace, as a result of which he was forced to voluntarily hand over the relevant documents to the special service (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 942. Ark. 228–234). When in the village of In Sheshory, Kosiv district, Ivano-Frankivsk region, representatives of the Sixties movement Vyacheslav Chornovil, Tetyana Tsymbal, and Leonid Korenevych in August 1965 tried to take part in the opening of the monument to T. Shevchenko; KGB officers monitored them and “took measures to prevent possible provocations” (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 943. Ark. 360–363).

In the first half of the 1960s, the KGB's preventive work against representatives of the Sixties was significantly intensified. In particular, in 1963, the author of samizdat texts, a resident of Kyiv, Yevheniya Kuznetsova, was subjected to preventive measures (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 944. Ark. 198). During 1963–1964, special services officers actively studied the activities of Ivan Hel, a Lviv resident, who was a member of a group of “nationalistically inclined youth.” After he attempted to distribute samizdat materials at the Shevchenko celebrations in Kaniv in May 1964, he was invited to the KGB Department for the Lviv region for a preventive interview (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 944. Ark. 196). In the same year, preventive measures were taken against the head of the Lviv creative youth club “Prolisok” (“Snowdrop”) Mykhailo Kosiv “for nationalistic manifestations” (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 944, File 194).

In October 1964, the Sixties artist Opanas Zalyvakha was invited to the premises of the Ivano-Frankivsk regional KGB. A special service captain named Synytsia conducted preventive conversations with the artist, which lasted for five days (Zbirka poiasnen, 1964). His goal was to intimidate the dissident, force him to stop being interested in Ukrainian culture and national ideas, and to abandon ties with like-minded people. Under pressure from a special service officer, the artist voluntarily handed over to the KGB 14 items of “anti-Soviet” literature, letters from the Kyiv artist Alla Horska, journalist V. Chornovil, artist Denys Ivantsiv, as well as banknotes from the period of the Ukrainian Revolution of 1917–1921, and a tape reel with recordings of Ukrainian songs. Among the published literature, in particular, were books by Dmytro Doroshenko “History of Ukraine” (Krakow – Lviv, 1942), Filaret Kolessa “Ukrainian People's Thoughts” (Lviv, 1920), Taras Shevchenko “Kobzar” with a dedication inscription by A. Horska “Glory to Ukraine! Glory forever!” (Zbirka poiasnen, 1964: 30–31).

Because of the conversations with the operative, O. Zalyvakha was forced to write a lengthy explanation on 31 pages. The artist provided detailed information about his own views on the policy of the Soviet authorities towards the Ukrainian people, reported on the reading and distribution of poems by young poets from the generation of the Sixties, and other samizdat literature. Under pressure from the KGB, the artist provided some information about his Kyiv, Lviv, and Ivano-Frankivsk acquaintances from the dissident community (Zbirka poiasnen, 1964). However, such careful preventive treatment of the artist was actually ineffective: in late 1964 – in the first half of 1965, O. Zalyvakha's oppositional public activity, his participation in the distribution of samizdat, even became somewhat more active.

Extremely serious and well-thought-out preventive work was carried out in April 1965 with the

Kyiv writer Borys Antonenko-Davydovych, a victim of Stalin's repressions, who had extensive connections and significant influence among the Sixties. On April 5, 12, and 16, the KGB of the Ukrainian SSR conducted three conversations with the writer, lasting a total of 15 hours. Two breaks were needed by the special services in order to study the writer's reaction to previous conversations and take this reaction into account in subsequent meetings. B. Antonenko-Davydovych was warned that if he continued to “incite certain individuals from among the creative youth to violate public order,” measures that are more stringent would be taken against him. Because of the preventive work, it was decided to continue surveillance of the writer (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 942. Ark. 170–180).

At least since the beginning of 1965, the special services were actively preparing for more active and radical actions against the Ukrainian Sixties environment and the samizdat distribution network. The “study” of active participants of the movement was intensified, in particular, Kyiv residents Ivan Rusyn, Oleksandr Martynenko, Yaroslav Hevrych, Ye. Kuznetsova, Lviv residents Mykhailo Horyn, Bohdan Horyn, Mykhailo Osadchy, Myroslava Zvarychevska, M. Kosiv, I. Hel, Ternopil residents Ihor Hereta and Metodiy Chubatyy, Ivano-Frankivsk residents O. Zalyvakha and Mykhailo Ozernyy, Lutsk resident Dmytro Ivashchenko, and others. (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 944. Ark. 176–200). In order to compromise the active dissidents finally in the eyes of the party leadership, they were apparently trying to present them as the heirs of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) underground. In particular, in the reports to the CC of the CPU dated January 7 and April 30, 1965, the Lviv Sixties were called “a group of nationalists trying to carry out anti-Soviet activities,” which were linked to the former organizational referent of the Horodotskyi district branch of the OUN, a “cadre Ukrainian nationalist” Stepan Buturyyn (SSA SSU. F. 16. Spr. 942. Ark. 239).

6. Conclusions

Thus, in the first half of the 1960s, the KGB developed specific tactics against the Sixties, which differed from practices against underground organizations. Instead of mass arrests, dominated agent-operational measures, prevention and ideological pressure. Already in the late 1950s, the foundation of systemic control was laid – an extensive agent network, mass “preventive conversations”, recruitment attempts (I. Dzyuba) and interrogations (I. Drach, Ye. Sverstyuk) demonstrated a fairly rapid reaction of the punitive bodies to the activation of the cultural movement. The resolution of the CC of the CPU in 1959 and the union order of 1962 provided a normative basis for this work, orienting the special service towards the intelligentsia and youth as an environment of potential “ideological sabotage”. In 1963–1964, the

pressure took on more pronounced forms: along with public ideological campaigns, intelligence operations were launched, in particular, the case of the group development “88” was opened, which was probably coordinated from the Union center. The totality of the recorded measures indicates a transition from fragmentary surveillance to systematic preparation of a large-scale repressive action, implemented already in 1965.

The struggle for the “Symonenko legacy” was a significant issue in the KGB’s activities against the Sixties. The intensification of preventive work in the mid-1960s indicates that the KGB sought not only to control but also to intercept the semantic leadership among the sixties. Monitoring of I. Dzyuba’s speech, attempts to isolate the archive of V. Symonenko, inspired public discrediting campaigns (libel against I. Svitlychny) demonstrated a combination of

operational and propaganda tools. At the same time, individualized prevention in the cases of V. Lobko, I. Hel, M. Kosiv, O. Zalyvakha, and B. Antonenko-Davydovych served the function of intimidation, gathering information, and building an evidence base for future accusations. It is significant that even hours-long conversations and coercion to “repent” did not guarantee the cessation of activity, which led to further radicalization of the actions of the special services. Active “study” of regional cells and an attempt to link the sixties with the OUN underground completed the formation of the narrative about the “heirs of the nationalists,” which became the ideological basis for subsequent arrests. Thus, in the first half of the 1960s, an institutional, agentic, and propaganda infrastructure for the fight against the sixties was created, which determined the nature of the repressive policy of the middle and second half of the decade.

Bibliography:

1. Бажан О. Реформування органів держбезпеки УРСР у 1950 – першій половині 1960-х рр. *Матеріали круглого столу 19 грудня 2013 р., м. Київ*. Київ, 2014. С. 312–333.
2. Галузевий державний архів Служби безпеки України (ГДА СБУ). Ф. 16. Спр. 940. 260 арк.
3. ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Спр. 941. 476 арк.
4. ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Спр. 942. 432 арк.
5. ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Спр. 943. 393 арк.
6. ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Спр. 944. 362 арк.
7. ГДА СБУ. Ф. 16. Спр. 1074. 362 арк.
8. Зайцев Ю. Комітет державної безпеки – охоронний загін КППС. *Наукові зошити історичного факультету Львівського університету*. 2012–2013. Вип. 12–14. С. 381–406.
9. Збірка пояснень художника Опанаса Заливахи укладена співробітником УКГБ по Івано-Франківській області капітаном Синицею за час від 28 жовтня по 31 жовтня 1964 р. *Електронний архів українського визвольного руху*. 1964. 31 арк. URL: <https://avr.org.ua/viewDoc/29536> (дата звернення: 23.02.2026).
10. Іваненко В. Із поетів – у секоти. 2024. URL: <https://ukrainainc.net/2024/12/19/20726/> (дата звернення: 23.02.2026).
11. Касьянов Г. Незгодні: українська інтелігенція в русі опору 1960–1980-х років. Київ: Кліо, 2019. 248 с.
12. Мокрик Р. Бунт проти імперії: українські шістдесятники. Київ: А-БА-БА-ГА-ЛА-МА-ГА, 2023. 416 с.
13. Обертас О. Український самвидав: літературна критика та публіцистика (1960-і – початок 1970-х років). Київ: Смолоскип, 2010. 300 с.
14. Паска Б. Луцький осередок українського національного руху в середині 60-х років ХХ століття. *Наукові праці історичного факультету Запорізького національного університету*. 2015. Вип. 44. Том 1. С. 255–263.
15. Паска Б. Основні віхи дисидентської діяльності Валентина Мороза на Івано-Франківщині у 1964–1965 роках. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького національного університету імені Юрія Федьковича: Історія*. 2016. № 1. С. 61–68.
16. Русначенко А. Національно-визвольний рух в Україні: середина 1950-х – початок 1990-х років. К.: Видавництво імені Олени Теліги, 1998. 720 с.
17. Секо Я. Культурницькі об’єднання 1960-х рр. у контексті руху шістдесятників. *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія Історія*. 2011. Вип. 1. С. 230–236.
18. Секо Я. Львівське середовище шістдесятників. *Наукові записки Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка. Серія: Історія*. 2015. Вип. 1. Ч. 1. С. 88–93.

References:

1. Bazhan, O. (2014). Reformuvannia orhaniv derzhbezpeky URSR u 1950 – pershii polovyni 1960-kh rr. [Reform of the state security organs of the Ukrainian SSR in the 1950s and the first half of the 1960s.]. *Materialy kruhloho stolu 19 hrudnia 2013 r., m. Kyiv – Materials of the round table December 19, 2013, Kyiv*. Kyiv. 312–333. [in Ukrainian].

2. *Haluzeyvi derzhavnyi arkhiv Sluzhby bezpeky Ukrainy (HDA SBU) – Sectoral State Archives of the Security Service of Ukraine (SSA SSU)*. F. 16. Spr. 940. 260. [in Russian].
3. *HDA SBU – SSA SSU*. F. 16. Spr. 1074. 362. [in Russian].
4. *HDA SBU – SSA SSU*. F. 16. Spr. 941. 476. [in Russian].
5. *HDA SBU – SSA SSU*. F. 16. Spr. 942. 432. [in Russian].
6. *HDA SBU – SSA SSU*. F. 16. Spr. 943. 393. [in Russian].
7. *HDA SBU – SSA SSU*. F. 16. Spr. 944. 362. [in Russian].
8. Ivanenko, V. (2024). Iz poetiv – u seksoty [From poets to informers]. <https://ukrainainc.net/2024/12/19/20726/> (last accessed: 23.02.2026). [in Ukrainian].
9. Kasianov, H. (2019). Nezghodni: ukrainska intelihentsiia v rusi oporu 1960–1980-kh rokiv [Dissenters: Ukrainian intelligentsia in the resistance movement of the 1960s–1980s]. Kyiv: Klio. 248. [in Ukrainian].
10. Mokryk, R. (2023). Bunt proty imperii: ukrainski shistdesiatnyky [Rebellion against the empire: Ukrainian sixties]. Kyiv: A-BA-BA-HA-LA-MA-HA. 416. [in Ukrainian].
11. Obertas, O. (2010). Ukrainskyi samvydav: literaturna krytyka ta publitsystyka (1960-i – pochatok 1970-kh rokiv) [Ukrainian samizdat: literary criticism and journalism (1960s – early 1970s)]. Kyiv: Smolohskyp. 300. [in Ukrainian].
12. Paska, B. (2015). Lutskyi oseredok ukrainskoho natsionalnoho rukhu v seredyni 60-kh rokiv XX stolittia [Lutsk center of the Ukrainian national movement in the mid-1960s]. *Naukovi pratsi istorychnoho fakultetu Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu – Scientific works of the Faculty of History of Zaporizhia National University*, 44–1, 255–263. [in Ukrainian].
13. Paska, B. (2016). Osnovni vikhy dysydentskoi diialnosti Valentyna Moroza na Ivano-Frankivshchyni u 1964–1965 rokakh [The main milestones of Valentyn Moroz’s dissident activities in the Ivano-Frankivsk region in 1964–1965]. *Naukovyi visnyk Chernivetskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Yuriiia Fedkovycha: Istoriiia – Scientific Bulletin of Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University: History*, 1, 61–68. [in Ukrainian].
14. Rusnachenko, A. (1998). Natsionalno-vyzvolnyi rukh v Ukraini: seredyna 1950-kh – pochatok 1990-kh rokiv [National liberation movement in Ukraine: mid-1950s – early 1990s]. Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo imeni Oleny Telihy. 720. [in Ukrainian].
15. Seko, Ya. (2011). Kulturnytski obiednannia 1960-kh rr. u konteksti rukhu shistdesiatnykiv [Cultural associations of the 1960s in the context of the sixties movement]. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. Seriiia Istoriiia – Scientific notes of the Volodymyr Hnatiuk Ternopil National Pedagogical University. History series*, 1, 230–236. [in Ukrainian].
16. Seko, Ya. (2015). Lvivske seredovyshche shistdesiatnykiv [Lviv’s sixties community]. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. Seriiia Istoriiia – Scientific notes of the Volodymyr Hnatiuk Ternopil National Pedagogical University. History series*, 1–1, 88–93. [in Ukrainian].
17. Zaitsev, Yu. (2012–2013). Komitet derzhavnoi bezpeky – okhoronnyi zahin KPRS [The Committee for State Security – the security unit of the CPSU]. *Naukovi zoshyty istorychnoho fakultetu Lvivskoho universytetu – Scientific notebooks of the Faculty of History of Lviv University*, 12–14, 381–406. [in Ukrainian].
18. Zbirka poiasnen khudozhnyka Opanasa Zalyvakhy ukladena spivrobotnykom UKGB po Ivano-Frankivskii oblasti kapitanom Synytseiu za chas vid 28 zhovtnia po 31 zhovtnia 1964 r. [A collection of explanations by artist Opanas Zalyvakha was compiled by Captain Synytsia, a UKGB officer for the Ivano-Frankivsk region, for the period from October 28 to October 31, 1964.]. (1964). *Elektronnyi arkhiv ukrainskoho vyzvolnoho rukhu – Electronic archive of the Ukrainian liberation movement*. 31. URL: <https://avr.org.ua/viewDoc/29536> (last accessed: 23.02.2026). [in Ukrainian].

Date of initial submission: 25.02.2026

Date of acceptance after peer review: 16.03.2026

Publication date: 07.04.2026

UDC 378.016:94:623.4:[378.091.212:93/94](477)
DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2026-53-4>

HISTORICAL WEAPONS SCIENCE IN THE SYSTEM OF TRAINING HISTORY TEACHERS IN UKRAINE

Ryzheva Nadiia Oleksandrivna,
*Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor,
Head of the History Department
Admiral Makarov National University of Shipbuilding
ryzheva.nadiya@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0001-8379-4325*

The article states that historical weapons science as an interdisciplinary field of historical science is an important component of reconstructing the past, as it makes it possible to reproduce not only military technologies, but also economic connections, social structure, and artistic-aesthetic concepts according to the societal development certain realities. Promising opportunities for involving the entire complex of historical weapons science in the modern educational space and integrating the history of weapons into the curricula for training future history teachers in Ukraine are considered in the defined context. **The aim of the study** is the analysis of professional historiography which allows future teachers to develop skills in the critical analysis of the history of armament problems and contributes to mastering the basic tools for researching the main stages of formation, development, and the current state of the scientific field. **Methodology:** general and specialized methods were used: comparative-historiographical, source studies, biographical and periodization methods. The integrative nature of the defined complex allows demonstrating to future specialists the significance of the role and place of weapons in military-political events and its indirect influence on societal and global realities. **Results:** it has been proven that the study of the history of armament is an integral part of understanding the worldview perception of war; the comprehension of the process of forming military traditions, historical memory, national identity, and the patriotic education of youth in general. The stages of the Ukrainian school of weapons science formation have been personified – from the first archaeological descriptions to the establishment of systematic scientific approaches and integration into the global scientific space. The trends of the current stage of development have been outlined – interdisciplinarity, combining historical-typological analysis with materials science methods, the introduction of digital technologies and the activation of international scientific cooperation. It has been emphasized that creating an integrally embedded platform of weapons science in the educational process is the key to developing students' ability for creative scientific research thinking. **Conclusions:** at the beginning of the 21st century the professional historiography of Ukrainian weapons science allows teachers of higher education institutions to rely on the scientific achievements of domestic researchers. It has been proven that historical weapons science have a promising opportunity for further integration into the educational process as a separate block of academic disciplines. They are intended to help create an integrated system of civilizational development based on a worldview understanding of the military component and to contribute to the development of key professional skills of future specialists who will be able to effectively influence the formation of historical consciousness among the youth of Ukraine.

Keywords: weapons science, transformation of historical education, weapons, military-historical research, Rus, Middle Ages, military affairs.

ІСТОРИЧНЕ ЗБРОЄЗНАВСТВО В СИСТЕМІ ПІДГОТОВКИ ВЧИТЕЛІВ ІСТОРІЇ В УКРАЇНІ

Рижєва Надія Олександрівна,
*доктор історичних наук, професор,
завідувач кафедри історії
Національного університету кораблебудування
імені адмірала Макарова
ryzheva.nadiya@gmail.com
orcid.org/0000-0001-8379-4325*

У статті зазначено, що історичне зброєзнавство як міждисциплінарна галузь історичної науки є важливою складовою реконструкції минулого, оскільки дає змогу відтворити не тільки військові технології, а й економічні зв'язки, соціальну структуру та художньо-естетичні уявлення за певними реаліями суспільного розвитку. У визначеному контексті розглянуто перспективні можливості залучення всього комплексу історичного зброєзнавства у сучасний освітянський простір та інтеграцію історії зброї в навчальні програми підготовки майбутніх вчителів історії в Україні. **Метою дослідження є** – аналіз фахової історіографії, яка дозволяє формувати у майбутніх вчителів навички критичного аналізу проблем історії озброєння, сприяє



оволодінню базовим інструментарієм дослідження основних етапів становлення, розвитку та сучасного стану наукової галузі. **Методологія:** використано загальні й спеціальні методи: порівняльно-історіографічний, джерелознавчий, біографічний, метод періодизації. Поєднувальний характер визначеного комплексу дозволяє довести майбутнім спеціалістам вагомість ролі і місця зброї у воєнно-політичних подіях та її опосередкований вплив на суспільні світові реалії. **Результати:** доведено, що вивчення історії озброєння є складовою частиною розуміння світоглядного сприйняття війни; осмислення процесу формування військових традицій, історичної пам'яті, національної ідентичності та патріотичного виховання молоді загалом. Персоніфіковано етапи формування української школи зброєзнавства – від перших археологічних описів до становлення системних наукових підходів і інтеграції у світовий науковий простір. Окреслено тенденції сучасного етапу розвитку – міждисциплінарність, поєднання історико-типологічного аналізу з методами матеріалознавства, упровадження цифрових технологій та активізацію міжнародної наукової співпраці. Наголошено, що створення у навчальному процесі інтеграційно-вмонтованого майданчика історії зброєзнавства є запорукою до формування у студентської молоді здатності до творчого науково-дослідного мислення. **Висновки:** на початку XXI ст. фахова історіографія українського зброєзнавства дозволяє викладачам закладів вищої освіти спиратися на наукові здобутки саме вітчизняних дослідників. Доведено, що історичне зброєзнавство має перспективну можливість до подальшого інтегрування в освітній процес окремим блоком навчальних дисциплін. Вони мають допомогти у створенні цілісної системи цивілізаційного розвитку на засадах світоглядного розуміння міліарної компоненти та сприяти розвитку ключових професійних навичок майбутніх спеціалістів, які зможуть ефективно впливати на формування історичної свідомості молоді України.

Ключові слова: зброєзнавство, трансформація історичної освіти, зброя, військово-історичні дослідження, Русь, середньовіччя, військова справа.

1. Introduction

Historical weapons science, as an interdisciplinary branch of historical science, is an important component of reconstructing the past, as it allows us to recreate not only military technologies but also economic relations, social structure, and artistic-aesthetic ideas at certain stages of societal development. In accordance with the modern conditions of the Ukrainian educational space modernization and in response to practical needs and the tasks of developing scientific and pedagogical thought, it is one of the leading components both in the process of training highly qualified specialists and in raising the overall political culture of the youth environment. **The relevance** of the chosen topic is determined by the urgent need of rethinking in the process of training highly qualified history teachers, the scientific and informational source field, which involves the ‘immersion’ of future specialists into problem-search directions of interdisciplinary branches of historical science. This is precisely what historical weapons science is, combining the history of military affairs, archeology, the history of material culture and art history. Historical weapons science has significant importance in the process of reconstructing the past, particularly the social structure, economy, military technologies, and cultural connections of society. **The purpose** of the study is the analysis of specialized historiography, which allows future teachers to develop skills in critical analysis of the problems of the history of armament and contributes to mastering the basic tool for studying the main stages of formation, development, and the current state of the field. **Methodology** – general and specialized methods have been used: comparative-historiographical, source study, biographical, and periodization method. The conjunctive nature of the defined set allows demonstrating to future specialists the significance of the role and place of weapons in military-political events and its indirect influence on societal global realities.

2. Formation of historiographical accents in scientific studies of the history of weaponry

The use of scientific research on the history of armament in the educational process needs by educators in higher education institutions needs to be specified according to the chronology of the formation of historiographical developments which gain a certain crystallization in the second half of the 20th century. In the works of I. Svieshnikov (Svieshnikov, 1992), P. Tolochko (Tolochko, 1970), A. Курпычнюков (Курпычнюков, 1966), historical weapons science acquires new accents (Svieshnikov, 1992: 253-262).

Ukraine's independence becomes a starting platform for new interdisciplinary scientific research. At the beginning of the 21st century, publications by D. Toichkin (Toichkin, 2000), O. Іакимович (Іакимович, 1996), F. Androshchuk (Androshchuk, 2003) and other Ukrainian researchers of weapons appear, allowing educators in higher education institutions to use their findings for reconstructing social and scientific-technical history. The concretization of future teachers' ideas about the history and significance of weapons is facilitated by comprehensive work of leading centers of domestic scientific thought. Ukraine is recognized as one of the centers of European historical weapons science and the following realities provide convincing evidence of this: based on the Institute of History of Ukraine of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, in partnership with a number of leading military-historical institutions, International Weapons Science Conferences are held (every two years) with participants including both native and foreign scholars (Toichkin, 2017).

Scientific developments of an interdisciplinary nature have been acquired in the collections of the Institute of Archaeology of the NAS of Ukraine (“Archaeological Studies”, 2004-2020) (Archaeology and Ancient History of Ukraine, 2019). The scientific-practical conference “Armory: the history of armament and military equipment” (organized by the

Hetman Petro Sahaidachnyi National Ground Forces Academy, Lviv) (Armory, 2020) contributes to the activation of future teachers' work in the direction of studying the history of Ukrainian military weapons. The available achievements indicate promising opportunities for involving the scientific developments of specialists in historical weapons science in the educational programs for training history teachers at higher education institutions.

At the same time, the accumulation of a significant volume of material artifacts, historical sources and scientific achievements in the field of weapons science requires further systematic generalization based on the methodological foundations of national pedagogy with an emphasis on specialized Ukrainian historiography.

3. The place of military history in the process of forming theoretical and practical knowledge of young specialists

In the contemporary realities of Ukraine, the study of historical weapons by future teachers is becoming particularly relevant as the history of weapons is an integral part of military traditions, statehood history and national identity. It forms structured historical knowledge, facilitates the 'immersion' of higher education students into the practical context of 'military history,' which emerges as an important motivator of humanity's historical progress.

In the professional development of future teachers, there is an increase in the demand for a comprehensive study of the history of weapons which allows to personalize the work of Ukrainian scholars. An essential educational and methodological component of this process is familiarization with native and foreign historiography on the issues of the weapons and military equipment history.

The critical analysis by literature lecturers and the informational content of thematic internet resources contributes to the development of key professional skills in students and fosters a desire to engage in scientific work, which should become an additional indicator of interest in the history of weapons science. In the process of historiographical analysis the lecturer should pay attention to the fact that, despite the growing scientific interest in the history of weapons, the problem of systemic analysis of methodological foundations and modern directions of development in Ukrainian historical weapons science remains relevant (Iakymovych, 1992: 17–20).

Special attention should be paid to the personalization of Ukrainian scholars who, at certain stages of historical progress, sought a comprehensive study of armaments. The concretization of historical notions for higher education students should be facilitated by drawing attention to the achievements of scholars and amateurs in the 19th century. In the Ukrainian lands at this time, the first attempts at the systematic study of armaments took place.

Archaeologists and ethnographers began to record material monuments of a military nature – sabers, swords, axes, spearheads, helmets, elements of protective gear (Antonovych, 1895). Researchers of medieval Rus played an important role in the process of systematizing scientific knowledge, in particular D. Samokvasov (Samokvasov, 1884) and V. Antonovych, who laid the source base for the further development of military-historical studies (Antonovych, 1895; Svieshnikov, 1992).

The improvement of the level of professional training of higher education students is facilitated by the specialized historiography of Ukrainian and leading foreign researchers of the early 20th century. During this period, the level of professionalism of specialists, who focused not only indirectly but also purposefully on a specific subject, significantly increased. The study of historical weapons science was closely linked to the formation of the Ukrainian historical school in Lviv and Kyiv. A landmark event was the creation of a number of research studios that operated within scientific societies and museums in the 1920s–1930s in Galicia (Iakymovych, 1992: 10–16).

4. Personification of historical weapons science and its worldview-ideological interpretations in Ukraine

Immersing higher education students in the history of the Cossacks involves a creative scientific-research understanding of the informational content of thematic works by the outstanding Ukrainian historian, archaeologist, ethnographer, and folklorist Dmytro Iavornytskyi (Iavornytskyi, 1990). His works had a significant influence on the further development of Ukrainian historical weapons science and initiated a stable conception of the ancient Ukrainian warrior (Smolii, 1999: 18–22).

Purposeful use of professional literature in the process of working through lecture materials and preparing seminar sessions allows higher education students to conclude that Ukrainian historical weapons science throughout the 20th century developed at the intersection of military history, archaeology, and the history of material culture.

An additional motivational factor for modern students in studying weapons science could be the personification of the scientific and practical creativity of notable figures in Ukrainian historical thought. Among the pioneers of historical weapons science, a leading place belongs to Ivan Krypiakevych who initiated the systematic study of the armaments of Ukrainian lands in the context of European military tradition (Krypiakevych, 1936). His works became the foundation for the development of the weapons science school in Lviv and subsequent research in Kyiv and Kharkiv. Incorporating detailed biographical information is intended to help to form a personality that is aware of

belonging to the Ukrainian people and proud of its achievements.

Ivan Krypiakievych was an academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, a professor at Lviv State University named after I. Franko, known for his works on the history of the Cossacks and the liberation struggles of the 17th century. He was one of the first Ukrainian historians to comprehensively examine the development of armament in the context of national history from Rus to the 17th century. His fundamental work “History of the Ukrainian Army” of 1936 systematized military knowledge, the organization of the army and military symbolism, and described the armament of ancient Ukrainian warriors (Zabolotna, 2007). Ivan Krypiakievych was the first to attempt to correlate archaeological finds with written and iconographic sources which became a methodological breakthrough for Ukrainian weapons studies (Krypiakievych, 1992: 41–59). A feature of his approach was the attempt to differentiate the national specificity of armament, namely by emphasizing the formation of its own traditions in military culture in certain periods – Rus’, the Galicia-Volhynia Principality and the Cossack era (Krypiakievych, 1984: 102–110). The works of Ivan Krypiakievych combined the historical-descriptive method with elements of typological analysis which made it possible to create the first comprehensive periodization of the development of weapons in the territory of Ukraine (Krypiakievych, 1984: 95; Krypiakievych, 1936: 60–63).

A comprehensive analysis of I. Krypiakievych’s scientific heritage contributes to students’ understanding of the relevance of such works for modern historical weapons science. The typologies he formulated (despite the lack of a formalized apparatus and the limitations of the source base of his time) laid the conceptual foundations for further research on Ukrainian weaponry. Today, the provisions of the typology are refined and supplemented but the overall concept of the evolution of weaponry in the Ukrainian scientific space remains unchanged.

The works of V. Antonovych, D. Iavornytskyi and I. Krypiakievych laid the methodological foundations that became basic for subsequent generations of researchers – I. Sviashnikov (Sviashnikov, 1992), P. Tolochko (Tolochko, 1970), O. Kyrpychnykov (Kyrpychnykov, 1966) and others (Iakymovych, 1992: 4–5). It was precisely on the basis of their works that, in the second half of the 20th century, systematic archaeological study of medieval Rus’ weapons began. The researchers’ studies influenced the creation of museum catalogs and exhibitions which led to the popularization of the history of weapons in general (Sviashnikov, 1992: 253–262).

In the process of analyzing the history of the formation and development of Ukrainian historical weapons science, the teacher has the opportunity to focus on worldview-ideological interpretations of the essence of

its stages (Toichkin, 2009). Delving into the history of armaments involves forming in young people a critical approach to the available sources and their characteristics taking into account the socio-political features of certain periods. After the Second World War research in the field of ‘military’ history in Ukrainian lands was systematized within the framework of the Soviet historical paradigm which was limited by ideological clichés of ‘moscow-centrism’ (Horbyk, 2004). However, an objective understanding of the development of weapons science implies providing students with information about the formation of museum collections during this period, the exhibitions of military artifacts in Kyiv, Lviv, Kharkiv, in particular at the National Museum of the History of Ukraine and the Lviv Historical Museum (Popelnytska, 2020).

5. Scientific and Methodological Complex of Historical Weapons Science as a Transformational Component of Education in Ukraine

At the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st centuries in the process of training history teachers, the involvement by teachers of the entire set of weapons science materials as an interdisciplinary field becomes particularly significant. In accordance with the tasks of state-building, the development of historical weapons science in Ukraine is filled with landmark issues of both a new context and an educational nature.

Teaching compulsory and elective historical disciplines allows to use broadly the works of Dmytro Iavornytskyi and Mykola Arkas, which were previously banned. The research activity of students is stimulated by studies of contemporary Ukrainian scholars. Works devoted to the archaeological and typological aspects of the weapons of Rus’, the Galicia-Volhynia Principality and the Cossack era are emerging (Horbyk, 2004; Zabolotna, 2007; Iakymovych, 1992: 3-10).

The methodical support of the educational process begins to be accompanied by a visual series, including illustrations from historical treatises, works of art depicting military themes, exhibition photographs from museums, documentary photos and video materials (Toichkin, 2009).

It should be noted that innovative forms of work became possible thanks to the painstaking work of national scientists. Modern historical weapons science in Ukraine covers a wide range of directions – from reconstructing weapons manufacturing technologies to analyzing the symbolic and cultural aspects of their use. Projects on digital reconstruction, 3D modeling of historical samples and collaboration with restorers and reenactors are actively developing (Kotsiubivska, 2020; Toichkin, 2021). Research centers for the history of weapons include institutes of the National Academy of Sciences, university research schools and museums (both national and regional). Equally important are collective publications and conference

proceedings which consolidate local research and provide opportunities for comparative analysis (Iakymovych, 1992, pp. 14–18).

The transformation of historical education involves the inclusion of informational materials regarding innovative changes in the study of weaponry. For example, modern research on medieval weapons increasingly relies on a combination of traditional typology with materials science methods: metallography, chemical analysis (EDS, ICP-MS), microstructural study and radiocarbon dating. Accordingly, university educators have the opportunity to demonstrate with modern tools (analysis of the pattern-welded technology) the high level of metallurgical craftsmanship in the early Middle Ages (Anstee, 1961; Birch, 2013). The current realities are of significant importance for understanding the geographical and chronological context of weapon production.

The use of the entire scientific and methodological complex of the history of weaponry will allow future teachers to logically and argumentatively defend their own vision of the history of armament development and analyze problematic issues of civilizational progress.

6. Conclusions

At the beginning of the 21st century the accumulated body of professional historiography of

weapons science allows lecturers at higher education institutions, in the process of training future history teachers, to rely on the scientific achievements of Ukrainian scholars. In modern studies of the history of weapons science, there is a combination of traditional historical-archaeological approaches with modern materials science, digital and reconstruction technologies, which creates the prerequisites for the establishment of a new scientific paradigm that will allow Ukrainian arms studies to take a worthy place in global humanities research.

In general, historical weapons science, given the existing Ukrainian tradition, has a promising opportunity for further integration into the educational process of higher pedagogical education as a separate block of academic disciplines. They are intended to help to create a comprehensive system for training future history teachers and to encourage young people toward creative, innovative, responsible and ethically balanced professional activity.

Thus, in the modern Ukrainian scientific and educational space, the initiation and further expansion of the integrative platform of the history of weapons science in higher education institutions should be considered as a promising direction with an unquestionable emphasis in the process of training history teachers under the conditions of real challenges and social transformations.

Bibliography:

1. Антонович В. Б. Археологическая карта Киевской губернии. Москва : Типография М. Г. Волчанинова, 1895. 139+20 с.
2. Археологія і давня історія України. Інститут археології НАН України. Київ, щорічне видання. ISSN 2227-4952.
3. Горбик В. О., Денисенко Г. Г. Охорона та збереження пам'яток історії та культури в Україні: історичний аспект. Історичний журнал. 2004. № 5. С. 82–89.
4. Заболотна І. І. Крип'якевич – учень, співробітник, послідовник М. Грушевського. Вісник Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. 2007. № 91–93. С. 12–16.
5. Зброярня: історія розвитку озброєння та військової техніки: матеріали конф. Львів: НАСВ, 2020. 274 с.
6. Кирпичников А. Н. Древнерусское оружие. Вып. 1. Мечи и сабли IX–XIII вв. Москва; Ленинград: Наука, 1966. 104 с.
7. Коціубівська К., Баранський С. 3D-модельовання при відновленні історико-культурних цінностей. Цифрова платформа: інформаційні технології в соціокультурній сфері. 2020. Т. 3. № 1. С. 59–68. DOI: 10.31866/2617-796x.3.1.2020.206109
8. Крип'якевич І. Галицько-Волинська держава. Львів: Вид-во АН УРСР, 1984. 368 с.
9. Крип'якевич І. Історія українського війська. Київ: Генеза, 1992. 432 с.
10. Крип'якевич І., Гнатевич Б. Історія Українського Війська. Львів: Іван Тиктор, 1936. 298 с.
11. Попельницька О. О., Шевченко О. В. З досвіду побудови виставки «Зброя в колекції Національного музею історії України: від давнини до сучасності». Воєнно-історичний вісник. 2020. Т. 38. № 4. С. 45–53. DOI: 10.33099/2707-1383-2020-38-4-45-53.
12. Самоквасов Д. Я. Древности русского права. Москва: Типография Императорского Московского университета, 1884. 332 с.
13. Свешніков І. К. Битва під Берестечком. Львів: Слово, 1992. 304 с.
14. Смолій В. А., Степанков В. С. Українська національна революція XVII століття: проблеми, пошуки, узагальнення. Київ: Альтернативи, 1999. 352 с.
15. Толочко П. П. Древний Киев. Київ; Львів: Наукова думка; Ін-т археології НАН України, 1970. 416 с.

16. Тоїчкін Д. В. Етапи розвитку зброєзнавчої історіографії Старого Світу та короткий огляд розвитку зброєзнавства у Європі до кінця XIX ст. Військово-науковий вісник. 2021. № 35. С. 238–251. DOI: 10.33577/2313-5603.35.2021.238-251
17. Тоїчкін Д. В. упоряд. Історія давньої зброї. Зб. наук. пр. Вип. 2016. Київ: Ін-т історії України НАНУ, 2017. 476 с.
18. Тоїчкін Д. В. Холодна зброя як складова комплексу українського козацького озброєння XVII ст.: характеристика та проблеми формування. Спеціальні історичні дисципліни: питання теорії та методики. 2000. Число 5. С. 115–128.
19. Тоїчкін Д. В. Українське зброєзнавство: досвіди системних досліджень. Спеціальні історичні дисципліни: питання теорії та методики. 2009. Вип. 16. С. 253–262.
20. Яворницький Д. І. Історія запорозьких козаків. У 3 т. Т. 1. Львів: Світ, 1990. 592 с.
21. Якимович Б. З. Збройні Сили України: нарис історії. Львів: Ін-т українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України; Просвіта, 1996. 360 с.
22. Якимович Б. Історіографічні аспекти дослідження українського війська. Історія українського війська (від княжих часів до 20-х років XX ст.). Львів: Світ, 1992. 702 с.
23. Androshchuk F. The «Ljudota Sword?» (An Episode of Contacts Between Britain and Scandinavia in the Late Viking Age). *Ruthenica*. 2003. Vol. 2. P. 15–25.
24. Anstee J., Biek L., Allen N. A Study in Pattern-Welding. *Medieval Archaeology*. 1961. Vol. 5. P. 101–108.
25. Birch T. Does pattern-welding make Anglo-Saxon swords stronger? T. Birch. *Accidental and Experimental Archaeometallurgy*. Ed. D. Dungworth, R. C. P. Doonan. London: Historical Metallurgy Society, 2013. P. 127–134.

References:

1. Antonovych V. B. *Arkheolohycheskaia karta Kyevskoi hubernyy*. Moskva: Tipohrafiia M. H. Volchanynova, 1895. 139+20 s.
2. *Arkheolohiia i davnia istoriia Ukrainy*. Instytut arkeolohii NAN Ukrainy. Kyiv, shchorichne vydannia. ISSN 2227-4952.
3. Horbyk V. O., Denysenko H. H. Okhorona ta zberezhennia pamiatok istorii ta kultury v Ukraini: istorychnyi aspekt. *Istorychnyi zhurnal*. 2004. № 5. S. 82–89.
4. Iakymovych B. Z. *Zbroini Syly Ukrainy: narys istorii*. Lviv: In-t ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy; Prosvita, 1996. 360 s.
5. Iakymovych B. *Istoriografichni aspekty doslidzhennia ukrainskoho viiska*. Istoriiia ukrainskoho viiska (vid kniazhykh chasiv do 20-kh rokiv KhKh st.). Lviv: Svit, 1992. 702 s.
6. Iavornytskyi D. I. *Istoriia zaporozkykh kozakiv*. U 3 t. T. 1. Lviv: Svit, 1990. 592 s.
7. Kotsiubivska K., Baranskyi S. 3D-modeliuvannia pry vidnovlenni istoryko-kulturnykh tsinnostei. Tsyfrova platforma: informatsiini tekhnologii v sotsiokulturnii sferi. 2020. T. 3. № 1. S. 59–68. DOI: 10.31866/2617-796x.3.1.2020.206109
8. Krypiakevych I. *Halytsko-Volynska derzhava*. Lviv: Vyd-vo AN URSR, 1984. 368 s.
9. Krypiakevych I. *Istoriia ukrainskoho viiska*. Kyiv: Henez, 1992. 432 s.
10. Krypiakevych I., Hnatevych B. *Istoriia Ukrainskoho Viiska*. Lviv: Ivan Tyktor, 1936. 298 s.
11. Курпичников А. Н. *Drevnerusskoe oruzhye*. Выр. 1. *Mechy y sably IX–XIII vv*. Moskva; Lenynhrad: Nauka, 1966. 104 s.
12. Popelnytska O. O., Shevchenko O. V. Z dosvidu pobudovy vystavky «Zbroia v kolektsii Natsionalnoho muzeiu istorii Ukrainy: vid davnyiny do suchasnosti». *Voienno-istorychnyi visnyk*. 2020. T. 38. № 4. S. 45–53. DOI: 10.33099/2707-1383-2020-38-4-45-53.
13. Samokvasov D. Ya. *Drevnomy russkogo prava*. Moskva: Tipohrafiia Ymperatorskoho Moskovskoho unyversyteta, 1884. 332 s.
14. Smolii V. A., Stepankov V. S. *Ukrainska natsionalna revoliutsiia XVII stolittia: problemy, poshuky, uzahalnennia*. Kyiv: Alternatyvy, 1999. 352 s.
15. Svieshnikov I. K. *Bytva pid Berestechkom*. Lviv: Slovo, 1992. 304 s.
16. Toichkin D. V. Etapy rozvytku zbroieznachoi istoriografii Staroho Svitua ta korotkyi ohliad rozvytku zbroieznachstva u Yevropi do kintsia XIX st. *Viiskovo-naukovyi visnyk*. 2021. № 35. S. 238–251. DOI: 10.33577/2313-5603.35.2021.238-251
17. Toichkin D. V. *uporiad. Istoriiia davnoi zbroi*. Zb. nauk. pr. Vyp. 2016. Kyiv: In-t istorii Ukrainy NANU, 2017. 476 s.
18. Toichkin D. V. *Kholodna zbroia yak skladova kompleksu ukrainskoho kozatskoho ozbroiennia XVII st.: kharakterystyka ta problemy formuvannia*. Spetsialni istorychni dystsypliny: pytannia teorii ta metodyky. 2000. Chyslo 5. S. 115–128.

19. Toichkin D. V. Ukrainske zbroieznavstvo: dosvidy systemnykh doslidzhen. Spetsialni istorychni dystsypliny: pytannia teorii ta metodyky. 2009. Vyp. 16. S. 253–262.
20. Tolochko P. P. Drevnyi Kyev. Kyiv; Lviv: Naukova dumka; In-t arkheolohii NAN Ukrainy, 1970. 416 s.
21. Zabolotna I. I. Krypiakevych – uchen, spivrobotnyk, poslidovnyk M. Hrushevskoho. Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Tarasa Shevchenka. 2007. № 91–93. S. 12–16.
22. Zbroiarnia: istoriia rozvytku ozbroiennia ta viiskovoi tekhniki: materialy konf. Lviv: NASV, 2020. 274 s.
23. Androshchuk F. The «Ljudota Sword?» (An Episode of Contacts Between Britain and Scandinavia in the Late Viking Age). *Ruthenica*. 2003. Vol. 2. P. 15–25.
24. Anstee J., Biek L., Allen N. A Study in Pattern-Welding. *Medieval Archaeology*. 1961. Vol. 5. P. 101–108.
25. Birch T. Does pattern-welding make Anglo-Saxon swords stronger? T. Birch. *Accidental and Experimental Archaeometallurgy*. Ed. D. Dungworth, R. C. P. Doonan. London : Historical Metallurgy Society, 2013. P. 127–134.

Date of initial submission: 19.02.2026
Date of acceptance after peer review: 20.03.2026
Publication date: 07.04.2026

UDC 94:[621.331-043.2:911.375.1(477.72-25)]

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2786-5118/2026-53-5>

URBAN TRANSFORMATION OF KHERSON AT THE TURN OF THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES: ELECTRIC TRANSPORT AS A MECHANISM OF URBAN MODERNIZATION

Skrypnyk Denys Anatoliiovych,
*Postgraduate Student at the Department of History,
Archaeology, and Teaching Methodology
Kherson State University
dskrypnyk@ksu.ks.ua
orcid.org/0009-0009-5361-1781*

The purpose of this article is to analyze the processes of organization, evolution, and development of Kherson's urban space at the beginning of the 20th century in the context of modernization processes in southern Ukraine, in particular through the attempt to introduce electric trams under an agreement with Italian citizen V.F. Bosalini. The article compares Kherson with its neighboring cities, Odesa and Mykolaiv, where tramways were implemented, which allows us to assess the peculiarities of local urban transformation. **Methodologically, the study** is based on a comprehensive historical and urban analysis using a cybernetic approach to urban space management and the theory of urban system modernization. It uses an analysis of archival sources, in particular a comparative analysis of the experience of other southern cities in the field of tramway implementation and technological modernization. The scientific novelty of the article lies in the comprehensive combination of two theoretical concepts: cybernetically oriented urban space management and the theory of modernization with a European orientation. Another scientific novelty is that we introduce new archival documents into scientific circulation. **The main content** of the article shows that the agreement with Bosalini contained a potential management system integrating transport, energy, and social infrastructure that corresponded to the principles of feedback, hierarchy, and adaptability. However, the project remained unrealized, which fundamentally distinguishes the modernization of Kherson and Mykolaiv from Odesa, where tramways contributed to the formation of integrated cybernetic systems of urban management and socio-economic dynamics. The article also highlights the role of foreign entrepreneurs as agents of European modernization who could have introduced advanced European technical standards, organizational models, and urban practices in Kherson. **The conclusions** emphasize that the lack of practical implementation of the project limited Kherson's modernization potential, leaving its urban space in a state of potential but incomplete transformation.

Keywords: Kherson, tramization, urban space modernization, Europeanization, urbanism, Southern Ukraine.

МІСЬКА ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЯ ХЕРСОНА НА РУБЕЖІ ХІХ–ХХ СТ: ЕЛЕКТРОТРАНСПОРТ ЯК МЕХАНІЗМ УРБАНІСТИЧНОЇ МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЇ

Скрипник Денис Анатолійович,
*аспірант кафедри історії, археології
та методики викладання
Херсонського державного університету
dskrypnyk@ksu.ks.ua
orcid.org/0009-0009-5361-1781*

Метою статті є аналіз процесів організації, еволюції та розвитку міського простору Херсона на початку ХХ в контексті модернізаційних процесів Півдня України, зокрема через спробу впровадження електричного трамвая за договором з італійським підданим В.І. Босаліні. Стаття розглядає Херсон у порівнянні з містами-сусідами, Одесою та Миколаєвом, де трамвайзація була реалізована, що дозволяє оцінити особливості локальної урбаністичної трансформації. **Методологічно дослідження** ґрунтується на комплексному історико-урбаністичному аналізі з застосуванням теорії модернізації. Використано аналіз архівних джерел, зокрема порівняльний аналіз досвіду інших південних міст у сфері трамвайзації та технологічної модернізації. Наукова новизна статті полягає у залученні теорії модернізації з європейською орієнтацією. А також науковою новизною є те, що ми вводим до наукового обігу нові архівні документи. **Основний зміст статті** показує, що договір з В. Босаліні містив потенційну систему управління, інтегруючи транспортну, енергетичну та соціальну інфраструктури, яка відповідала принципам зворотного зв'язку, ієрархії та адаптивності. Проте проєкт залишився нереалізованим, що кардинально відрізняє модернізацію Херсона і Миколаєва з Одесою, де трамвайзація сприяла формуванню інтегрованих систем міського управління та соціально-економічної динаміки. Також у статті висвітлено роль іноземного підприємця як агента європейської модернізації, який міг би впровадити у Херсоні передові європейські технічні стандарти, організаційні моделі та урбаністичні практики. **Висновки** підкреслюють,

© Skrypnyk D. A., 2026



This article is licensed under
a creative commons 4.0 international

що відсутність практичної реалізації проєкту обмежила модернізаційний потенціал Херсона, залишивши його міський простір у стані потенційної, але незавершеної трансформації.

Ключові слова: Херсон, трамвайзація, модернізація міського простору, європеїзація, урбаністика, Південь України.

1. Introduction

The relevance of this research, in our view, lies in the fact that the study of the urban transformation of Kherson at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is important for understanding the processes of modernization in the cities of Southern Ukraine. Unlike the neighboring cities of Odesa and Mykolaiv, Kherson did not undergo a completed process of tramway development. This circumstance makes it possible to assess the specific features of local urban dynamics, the socio-economic consequences of unrealized infrastructure projects, and the potential of urban space during a period of accelerated modernization. The use of the contract between the Kherson City Administration and the Italian subject V. Bosalini provides a unique opportunity to analyze the urban and modernization concepts of the studied period through the prism of a single historical source. This document makes it possible to reconstruct the mechanisms of urban infrastructure planning, the interaction of administrative, technical, and social components, and to demonstrate the potential influence of European practices on the development of Kherson. The significance of this research is further reinforced by the fact that the source originates from the holdings of the State Archive of the Kherson Region, which was looted by Russian forces during the temporary occupation of the city in 2022. Work with this document simultaneously represents the process of introducing its contents into scholarly circulation and preserving important historical material for future research. We believe that the actualization of this source contributes to the expansion of the archival and historical corpus and creates opportunities for comparative analysis of urban development in Southern Ukraine at the beginning of the twentieth century, strengthening scholarly understanding of the local characteristics of modernization processes in the region.

The historiography of research on the urban space of Kherson and the southern region of Ukraine during the studied period makes it possible to outline the scholarly tradition and determine the place of our research within contemporary Ukrainian historiography. Within the context of recent studies on urbanism and municipal self-government in Southern Ukraine, two conditional groups of scholarly approaches can be distinguished: historical analytical studies and archaeological studies directly related to the restoration and introduction into scholarly circulation of documentary heritage.

Among contemporary historical studies are the works of such scholars as V. Konstantinova, A. Dorosheva, O. Cheremisin, and H. Mykhailenko. These researchers focus on the comprehensive analysis of

the urban space of southern Ukrainian cities, addressing issues of infrastructure development, socio-economic organization, and modernization processes. In particular, V. Konstantinova (Konstantinova, 2010) pays attention to the development of urban space and its influence on the socio-economic dynamics of cities, while A. Dorosheva (Dorosheva, 2009) analyzes administrative and legislative mechanisms of urban governance within a regional context. In our opinion, their works provide an important methodological and analytical basis for evaluating urban processes; however, they do not always focus on specific archival documents, which limits the possibility of reconstructing local management practices and specific modernization projects such as electrification, telephony, and others.

Particular attention in historiography should be paid to the works of O. Cheremisin and H. Mykhailenko (Mykhailenko, G., Cheremisin, 2022: 46–55), whose studies combine both historical analysis and archaeological work. The historical dimension of their research is represented, in particular, in the monograph «Municipal Self-Government in Southern Ukraine in 1785-1917», in which O. Cheremisin (Cheremisin, 2017) provides an in-depth analytical overview of the development of administrative and urban institutions in the region. He examines the dynamics of the formation of municipal governance, the interaction between local authorities and entrepreneurs, and the socio-economic consequences of infrastructure projects. Professor O. Cheremisin formulates his own methodological approaches to the evaluation of urban development, emphasizing the complexity of the interaction between technical, administrative, and social components of the urban environment. Importantly, his research allows comparison of real modernization processes in different southern cities and the identification of local characteristics that were significant for Kherson and its unfinished electric transport system.

The archaeological aspect of the work of O. Cheremisin and H. Mykhailenko is associated with the publication of sources from the State Archive of the Kherson Region (Cheremisin O., Mykhailenko H., 2025: 45-59). In these works, the researchers systematize and introduce into scholarly circulation materials that were previously inaccessible or preserved only in local archives. Of particular value are studies related to the preservation of cultural memory and the restoration of the historical corpus of sources, some of which were stolen by Russian occupying forces in 2022. Thanks to these publications, the scholarly community gains access to documents that make it possible to reconstruct local urban processes, evaluate the potential of modernization

projects, and analyze their socio-economic context. Importantly, the researchers combine analytical work with archaeography, creating opportunities for simultaneous historical interpretation and introduction of sources into scholarly circulation, which is directly relevant to the study of attempts to introduce electric transport in Kherson under the contract with V. Bosalini at the turn of the century.

Despite the quite representative body of previous research, historiography still contains little-known gaps to which this study is addressed. Contemporary works generally focus on traditional theoretical and methodological approaches within historical scholarship. They are limited to a general assessment of infrastructural changes and do not concentrate on specific local modernization projects that ultimately remained unrealized. In the case of Kherson, this concerns the attempt to introduce electric transport under the contract with V. Bosalini, which remained at the level of planning and formal agreements. Therefore, the study of local unrealized projects makes it possible to evaluate the potential of urban space and the dynamics of managerial decision-making in the context of accelerated modernization, an issue that remains insufficiently explored in contemporary historiography. Furthermore, there is a gap in the study of interconnected European modernization practices and local urban projects in Southern Ukraine. Although the works of O. Cheremisin and H. Mykhailenko cover both historical and archaeographic aspects, a detailed analysis of the influence of European technologies and entrepreneurial initiatives on the planning and development of urban transport in Kherson remains limited. The very fact that the project of V. Bosalini envisaged the integration of European electric transport standards demonstrates the need to study the mechanisms of Europeanization of local infrastructure, its regulatory framework, and its socio-economic consequences. At the same time, the role of archival sources, particularly those affected during the temporary occupation of Kherson in 2022, remains insufficiently highlighted in scholarly discourse. The study of the Bosalini contract (State Archive of the Kherson Region, F. 4, Op. 1, File 15), which has not previously been systematized or introduced into scholarly circulation, makes it possible to fill this gap while simultaneously demonstrating the importance of archaeographic work for the restoration of historical memory and ensuring access for the analysis of urban processes in the region, particularly in comparison with neighboring cities.

Therefore, the aim of this article is to analyze the processes of organization, evolution, and development of the urban space of Kherson at the beginning of the twentieth century in the context of modernization processes in Southern Ukraine, particularly through the attempt to introduce an electric tramway under a contract with the Italian subject V. Bosalini.

To achieve this goal, our research proposes a theoretical and methodological concept of the modernization theory of urban space oriented toward European practices, in which the key factor is the influence of foreign entrepreneurs and technical innovations that introduced elements of Europeanization into the city. In the case of Kherson, a particularly important role was played by the Italian subject V. Bosalini, whose contract envisaged the creation of an electric tramway network according to contemporary European standards. This reflects the aspiration of the local administration to integrate the city into a broader European context of technical and urban modernization, using foreign experience as a model for the transformation of urban space.

The theory of urban modernization is based on the principles of technological borrowing and cultural adaptation: the introduction of new engineering solutions, transport systems, architectural standards, and organizational models of governance that enable a city to increase the efficiency of its functioning and approach European norms. The project of V. Bosalini demonstrates a classical example of such an approach planning an electric tramway together with all related infrastructural elements. The organization of traffic, standards for tramcars and pavilions, and mechanisms of control and safety were intended to create in Kherson a potential European urban space integrated into the modernization principles of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Within this system, the entrepreneur acts as an agent of change through whom the city gains access to modern engineering solutions, organizational models, and standards of urban development oriented toward European practice. In Kherson this process remained potential, demonstrating the limitations of modernization when planned projects are not fully implemented and highlighting the importance of implementing innovative practices to achieve genuine Europeanization of urban space.

2. The Contract between V. Bosalini and the Kherson City Duma as a Model of Modernization-Oriented Urban Governance

An analysis of the contract concluded between the Kherson City Duma and the Italian subject V. Bosalini allows this document to be regarded as a conceptual model of modernization-oriented urban governance, in which European technical standards, new forms of administrative interaction, and elements of the regulation of socio-economic processes were combined. Above all, the contract demonstrates the orientation of the Kherson City Duma and municipal administration toward the Europeanization of urban space. The choice of a foreign contractor was not accidental. For the municipal authorities, V. Bosalini represented access to contemporary electric transport technologies, organizational schemes for the operation

of tramway networks, and managerial practices that had already been tested in leading European cities. The text of the contract reveals an intention to integrate Kherson into the broader European urban space by introducing electric transport as a key element of the modern city. In this context, the tramway should be considered from several perspectives: on the one hand, it was an infrastructural object; on the other, it was an instrument for organizing and intensifying population mobility.

The entrepreneur V. Bosalini appears as an agent of technological development and transformation. He was entrusted with the functions of designing, constructing, and commissioning an integral electric tramway system, which included the laying of tracks, the construction of power stations, the supply of rolling stock, the organization of depots and pavilions, as well as the provision of technical maintenance. He was expected not only to ensure the material implementation of the project but also to facilitate the transfer of innovative knowledge and technologies into the urban environment of Kherson. Through this contract, the municipal authorities effectively delegated to a private entrepreneur a significant share of the functions associated with infrastructure modernization, which was a characteristic feature of European models of urban development at the beginning of the twentieth century (State Archive of the Kherson Region, F. 4, Op. 1, File 15: 2–4).

The model of governance embedded in the contract demonstrates a complex hierarchy of interaction between the contractor and the bodies of municipal self-government. The Kherson City Duma and municipal administration retained regulatory and supervisory functions, determining technical parameters, deadlines for the completion of works, operating conditions, passenger tariffs, and traffic safety requirements. V. Bosalini, in turn, was obliged to comply with the established regulations, report on the progress of works, respond to comments from the municipal authorities, and eliminate identified deficiencies. Such a system of governance reflects the principle of hierarchy, whereby strategic decisions remained within the competence of municipal bodies, while the operational implementation of the project was entrusted to a private entrepreneur (State Archive of the Kherson Region, F.4, Op. 1, File 15: 6–8).

An important element of the contract is the set of feedback mechanisms manifested in the prescribed forms of control, inspection, and sanctions. The municipal administration had the right to inspect facilities, demand corrections to design decisions, and impose fines in the event of violations of contractual conditions. The intensity of tram traffic, the technical condition of the infrastructure, and compliance with operating rules became objects of constant monitoring, making it possible to adapt the functioning of the system to the actual conditions of

urban life. The agreement thus established a distinctly dynamic model of governance in which information about the operation of the system's elements could directly influence subsequent administrative decisions.

The text of the contract also indicates that the principle of adaptability was embedded in the governance structure of this innovative technology. It provided for the possibility of adjusting routes, schedules, technical parameters, and even organizational forms of service depending on passenger growth, urban expansion, or changes in the socio-economic environment. The city appears here as an open system capable of responding to external and internal challenges, while the electric tramway is presented as an instrument of such adaptation.

The specific features of the urban governance model implemented by the Kherson City Duma and municipal administration are revealed in their attempt to combine public control with private initiative. The municipal authorities did not limit themselves to the role of a formal client; rather, they sought to create a comprehensive regulatory framework for the functioning of the new mode of transport, regulating not only technical but also social aspects: the rules for tram use, interaction with other forms of transport, and issues of safety and public order (State Archive of the Kherson Region, F. 4, Op. 1, File 15: 9–14).

This indicates the formation in Kherson of a modern managerial paradigm oriented toward a systemic vision of urban space. The contract with V. Bosalini thus emerges as a model of modernization-oriented urban governance in which European technological standards were combined with local administrative practices. Although the project was never implemented, the text of the contract itself reflects an attempt to integrate Kherson into the European urban context, to establish institutional and infrastructural foundations for the qualitative transformation of the urban environment, and to create regulatory mechanisms corresponding to the challenges of the early twentieth century.

An analysis of the contract concluded between the Kherson City Duma and the Italian subject V. Bosalini allows this document to be regarded as a conceptual model of modernization-oriented urban governance, in which European technical standards, new forms of administrative interaction, and elements of the regulation of socio-economic processes were combined. Above all, the contract demonstrates the orientation of the Kherson City Duma and municipal administration toward the Europeanization of urban space. The choice of a foreign contractor was not accidental. For the municipal authorities, V. Bosalini represented access to contemporary electric transport technologies, organizational schemes for the operation of tramway networks, and managerial practices that had already been tested in leading European cities. The text of the contract reveals an intention to integrate

Kherson into the broader European urban space by introducing electric transport as a key element of the modern city. In this context, the tramway should be considered from several perspectives: on the one hand, it was an infrastructural object; on the other, it was an instrument for organizing and intensifying population mobility.

The entrepreneur V. Bosalini appears as an agent of technological development and transformation. He was entrusted with the functions of designing, constructing, and commissioning an integral electric tramway system, which included the laying of tracks, the construction of power stations, the supply of rolling stock, the organization of depots and pavilions, as well as the provision of technical maintenance. He was expected not only to ensure the material implementation of the project but also to facilitate the transfer of innovative knowledge and technologies into the urban environment of Kherson. Through this contract, the municipal authorities effectively delegated to a private entrepreneur a significant share of the functions associated with infrastructure modernization, which was a characteristic feature of European models of urban development at the beginning of the twentieth century (State Archive of the Kherson Region, F. 4, Op. 1, File 15: 2–4).

The model of governance embedded in the contract demonstrates a complex hierarchy of interaction between the contractor and the bodies of municipal self-government. The Kherson City Duma and municipal administration retained regulatory and supervisory functions, determining technical parameters, deadlines for the completion of works, operating conditions, passenger tariffs, and traffic safety requirements. V. Bosalini, in turn, was obliged to comply with the established regulations, report on the progress of works, respond to comments from the municipal authorities, and eliminate identified deficiencies. Such a system of governance reflects the principle of hierarchy, whereby strategic decisions remained within the competence of municipal bodies, while the operational implementation of the project was entrusted to a private entrepreneur (State Archive of the Kherson Region, F. 4, Op. 1, File 15: 6–8).

An important element of the contract is the set of feedback mechanisms manifested in the prescribed forms of control, inspection, and sanctions. The municipal administration had the right to inspect facilities, demand corrections to design decisions, and impose fines in the event of violations of contractual conditions. The intensity of tram traffic, the technical condition of the infrastructure, and compliance with operating rules became objects of constant monitoring, making it possible to adapt the functioning of the system to the actual conditions of urban life. The agreement thus established a distinctly dynamic model of governance in which information about the operation of the system's

elements could directly influence subsequent administrative decisions.

The text of the contract also indicates that the principle of adaptability was embedded in the governance structure of this innovative technology. It provided for the possibility of adjusting routes, schedules, technical parameters, and even organizational forms of service depending on passenger growth, urban expansion, or changes in the socio-economic environment. The city appears here as an open system capable of responding to external and internal challenges, while the electric tramway is presented as an instrument of such adaptation.

The specific features of the urban governance model implemented by the Kherson City Duma and municipal administration are revealed in their attempt to combine public control with private initiative. The municipal authorities did not limit themselves to the role of a formal client; rather, they sought to create a comprehensive regulatory framework for the functioning of the new mode of transport, regulating not only technical but also social aspects: the rules for tram use, interaction with other forms of transport, and issues of safety and public order (State Archive of the Kherson Region, F. 4, Op. 1, File 15: 9–14).

This indicates the formation in Kherson of a modern managerial paradigm oriented toward a systemic vision of urban space. The contract with V. Bosalini thus emerges as a model of modernization-oriented urban governance in which European technological standards were combined with local administrative practices. Although the project was never implemented, the text of the contract itself reflects an attempt to integrate Kherson into the European urban context, to establish institutional and infrastructural foundations for the qualitative transformation of the urban environment, and to create regulatory mechanisms corresponding to the challenges of the early twentieth century.

3. The Modernization Potential of Kherson and Its European Orientation through the Electric Tramway Project

Within the framework of analyzing the contract with V. Bosalini, we consider the electric tramway project as a concentrated manifestation of the modernization potential of Kherson at the beginning of the twentieth century, which, in our opinion, reflected the strong orientation of municipal authorities toward European models of urban organization. The involvement of an Italian entrepreneur as a contractor indicates the conscious intention of the Kherson City Duma to integrate the city into the European urban context by adopting managerial practices, operational models, the organization of public space, and electric transport technologies.

In this sense, the Italian entrepreneur acted as an intermediary between Western European technological

achievements and the needs of the local community. The tramway project in Kherson had the potential to transform not only the transport system of the city but also its spatial structure. The planned routes implied the activation of peripheral districts, an increase in land value along tram lines, the formation of new centers of commercial activity, and a transformation in the logic of urban mobility.

In analyzing the modernization potential of Kherson, we refer to the scholarly works of O. Cheremisin, who repeatedly emphasized in his studies the role of municipal self-government as an active agent of socio-economic transformations. In particular, in his article on market transformations and the modernization of land relations in Southern Ukraine, he demonstrates that during the studied period municipal councils actively used the instruments of self-government to redistribute resources, form new economic practices, and stimulate entrepreneurial activity (Cheremisin, 2021: 136–138). We are inclined to believe that the project proposed by V. Bosalini fits precisely into this logic: the electric tramway was envisioned as a mechanism for stimulating the real estate market, transforming land relations, and reorganizing the spatial structure of the city.

Furthermore, in his work on the Duma model of local self-government as a political institution, O. Cheremisin emphasizes the institutional maturity of southern Ukrainian cities, which since the second half of the nineteenth century had been forming their own administrative traditions. In our opinion, this explains why the Kherson City Duma was prepared to undertake complex infrastructure projects involving foreign capital (Cheremisin, 2021: 63–66). The model of cooperation with V. Bosalini demonstrates that municipal self-government possessed sufficient administrative and financial potential to initiate modernization programs, although their practical implementation encountered a number of objective and subjective obstacles.

At the same time, in our view, the failure to implement the electric tramway project became a key factor that limited the modernization potential of Kherson. We tend to believe that the absence of a tramway network led to the preservation of traditional forms of mobility, restrained the development of certain districts, and resulted in a lower level of spatial integration of the city compared to Odesa and Mykolaiv, where tramway systems were successfully implemented. This observation also corresponds with the conclusions of O. Cheremisin regarding the role of financial instruments of municipal self-government, particularly the system of special and additional taxes which, as he demonstrates, played an important role in supporting infrastructure transformations (Cheremisin, 2020: 60–67). We believe that limited financial resources and the difficulty of coordinating

the interests of various local elites may have been among the primary reasons for the failure of the Bosalini project.

As a result, the electric tramway project in Kherson appears, in our view, as a symbol of unrealized European modernization. It reveals the high level of ambition of municipal authorities, their orientation toward Western European models, and their readiness for institutional and spatial transformations. At the same time, however, it demonstrates the structural limitations of local development. We believe that precisely through the analysis of this unrealized project it becomes possible to most fully evaluate the modernization potential of Kherson at the beginning of the twentieth century and to understand why the city differed significantly from other centers of Southern Ukraine, where tramway systems became reality rather than remaining merely ambitious plans. Such unrealized concepts often reveal structural imbalances, hidden conflicts of interest, resource constraints, and possibly even corruption schemes that under normal circumstances remain outside the focus of researchers.

In the case of Kherson, the contract with V. Bosalini represents a high level of strategic thinking on the part of municipal self-government. The project was drafted in detail, taking into account technical standards, administrative procedures, quality control mechanisms, financial guarantees, and long-term consequences for urban space. In our opinion, according to the totality of these parameters Kherson was not inferior to other southern Ukrainian cities and in some respects even surpassed them in the thoroughness of regulatory planning. However, this document also demonstrates the reverse side of the modernization process: the complexity, bureaucratic scale, and multi-level nature of the governance system, which required stable financial flows, high discipline among executors, and coordinated interaction between municipal authorities and private capital.

We tend to believe that, unlike Odesa and Mykolaiv, where tramway development became part of the broader economic dynamics of port and industrial centers, Kherson remained a city with a less diversified economic base. Its modernization efforts were largely dependent on individual entrepreneurial initiatives, the attitudes of local elites, levels of corruption, and limited competitiveness, and were therefore less protected against financial risks. Consequently, the failure or non-implementation of the Bosalini project should be viewed not as an accidental event but rather as a symptom of a systemic problem: the presence of ambitious plans without a sufficiently strong economic and administrative foundation to support them in the long term.

The analysis of this project also helps explain why the spatial development of Kherson followed a different trajectory than that of neighboring cities. The

absence of a tramway network meant that the city did not acquire a powerful integrative framework that in Mykolaiv and Odesa shaped patterns of settlement, the location of industrial zones, and the formation of transport corridors. In our opinion, for this reason Kherson preserved a more fragmented urban structure, in which peripheral districts remained weakly connected with the city center, while the real estate market developed more slowly.

Thus, the Kherson model of modernization demonstrates that the city stood on the threshold of profound transformations but was unable to cross that threshold, which ultimately determined the specific and unfinished character of the development of its urban space at the beginning of the twentieth century.

4. Conclusions

Based on the results of the conducted research, it is possible to formulate a number of generalizing conclusions that reflect both the specific features of the development of Kherson at the turn of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the broader patterns of urban modernization in Southern Ukraine. First of all, the analysis of the contract between the Kherson City Duma and the Italian entrepreneur made it possible to consider the electric tramway project as a comprehensive model of urban space governance that combined technical, administrative, financial, and social components within a single regulatory system.

We conclude that at the beginning of the twentieth century Kherson possessed sufficient institutional potential to initiate large-scale infrastructure transformations. The City Duma and municipal administration operated according to the principles of active self-government, demonstrating the ability for strategic planning, the attraction of foreign capital, and the adoption of European managerial practices.

The entrepreneur V. Bosalini introduced into the local environment of Southern Ukraine technical innovations and standards of urban organization that were characteristic of Western European cities. At the same time, the unfinished nature of the electric tramway project became an indicator of the structural limitations of Kherson's modernization. Despite the detailed concession terms, regulated procedures, and the presence of administrative ambitions, the city proved unable to provide stable financial and social conditions for the long-term implementation of the project. This significantly distinguished Kherson from neighboring cities of the same province, Mykolaiv and Odesa, where tramway systems became the foundation of a new spatial organization of urban life.

The analysis of the unrealized nature of the project allows us to identify the specific features of the Kherson model of modernization as a transitional one, situated between traditional forms of urban development and modern European standards. The absence of a tramway network led to the preservation of a fragmented urban spatial structure, slower integration of suburban territories, and a less dynamic development of the real estate market, which had long-term consequences for the socio-economic development of the city.

The study of the Kherson electric tramway project as an unrealized modernization initiative makes it possible to better understand the limits and contradictions of urban transformations in Southern Ukraine at the beginning of the twentieth century. It highlights the role of municipal self-government, foreign agents of modernization, and financial and economic factors in shaping urban space, while also identifying the reasons why Kherson remained outside the process of tramway development that defined the future appearance of other major cities in the region.

Bibliography:

1. Державний архів Херсонської області. Ф.4. Оп. 1. Спр. 15. «Проект договору з італійським громадянином В.І. Босаліні про улаштування трамвайного руху в місті Херсон». [1914 р.] 11 арк.
2. Дорошева, А. О. Самоврядування в приморських містах Півдня України в другій половині XIX ст. : дис ... канд. іст. наук: 07.00.01 історія України. Одеса. 2009. 195 с.
3. Константінова В. М. Урбанізація: південноукраїнський вимір (1861–1904 роках). Запоріжжя : АА Тандем. 2010. 569 с.
4. Черемісін О. В. Міське самоврядування на Півдні України в 1785–1917 рр. Херсон : Олді-плюс, 2017. 586 с.
5. Черемісін О.В., Михайленко Г.М. Джерела з історії земельної політики херсонського громадського самоврядування в 1912–1916 рр. *Південний архів (історичні науки)*. Вип. 50. 2025. С. 45–59.
6. Черемісін О.В. Джерело з історії міського самоврядування Херсона та роль єврейства в його управлінні на початку XX ст. *Південний архів (історичні науки)*. Вип. 48. 2024. С. 58–73.
7. O. Image of Foreign Colonizers in a Town Environment in the South of Ukraine in Travellers' Narratives at the End of the 18th – the First Half of the 19th Century. *Skhidnoievropeiskiy Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 25 2022, 46–55.
8. Черемісін О. В. Ринкові трансформації та модернізація земельних відносин на Півдні України: досвід міського самоврядування другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. *Підприємництво в аграрній сфері: глобальні виклики та ефективний менеджмент*. Вип.1. 2021. С. 136–138.

9. Черемісін О. В. Думська модель місцевого самоврядування як політичний інститут південноукраїнського регіону 1785-1870 рр. *Розвиток суспільних наук в сучасних умовах: теорія, методологія, практика*. Київ: Видавничий дім «Гельветика», 2021. Вип. 1. С. 63–66.
10. Черемісін О. В. Спеціальні та додаткові податки з міського населення Півдня України у 1870–1917 рр. *Київські історичні студії* № 1. (10). 2020. С. 60–67.

References:

1. Derzhavnyi arkhiv Khersonskoi oblasti. F.4. Op. 1. Spr. 15. «Proekt dohovoru z italiiskym hromadianynom V.I. Bosalini pro ulashtuvannia tramvainoho rukhu v misti Kherson». [Draft agreement with Italian citizen V.I. Bosalini on the establishment of tram service in the city of Kherson]. [1914 r.] 11 ark. [in Russian]
2. Dorosheva, A.O. (2009). *Samovriaduvannia v prymorskykh mistakh Pivdnia Ukrainy v druhii polovyni XIX st.* [Self-government in the coastal cities of southern Ukraine in the second half of the 19th century]: dys ... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.01 istoriia Ukrainy. Odesa. 195 s. [in Ukrainian]
3. Konstantinova V.M. (2010) *Urbanizatsiia: pivdenoukrainskyi vymir (1861–1904 rokakh)*. [Urbanisation: the southern Ukrainian dimension (1861–1904)]. Zaporizhzhia : AA Tan-dem. 569 s. [in Ukrainian]
4. Cheremisin O.V. (2017). *Miske samovriaduvannia na Pivdni Ukrainy v 1785–1917 rr.* [Local self-government in southern Ukraine in 1785–1917]. Kherson : Oldi-plius. 586 s. [in Ukrainian]
5. Cheremisin O.V., Mykhailenko H.M. (2025). Dzhherela z istorii zemelnoi polityky khersonskoho hromadskoho samovriaduvannia v 1912-1916 rr. [Sources on the history of land policy in Kherson local government in 1912–1916]. *Pivdennyi arkhiv (istorychni nauky)*. Vyp. 50. 2025. S. 45–59. [in Ukrainian]
6. Cheremisin O.V. (2024). Dzhherelo z istorii miskoho samovriaduvannia Khersona ta rol yevrestva v yoho upravlinni na pochatku XX st. [A source on the history of municipal self-government in Kherson and the role of Jews in its administration at the beginning of the 20th century]. *Pivdennyi arkhiv (istorychni nauky)*. Vyp. 48. S. 58–73. [in Ukrainian]
7. Mykhailenko, G. & Cheremisin, O. (2022). Image of Foreign Colonizers in a Town Environment in the South of Ukraine in Travellers' Narratives at the End of the 18th – the First Half of the 19th Century. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 25, 46–55. [in English]
8. Cheremisin O.V. (2021). Rynkovi transformatsii ta modernizatsiia zemelnykh vidnosyn na Pivdni Ukrainy: dosvid miskoho samovriaduvannia druhoi polovyny XIX – pochatku XX st. [Market transformations and modernisation of land relations in southern Ukraine: the experience of municipal self-government in the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries]. *Pidpriemnytstvo v aharnii sferi: hlobalni vyklyky ta efektyvnyi menedzhment*. Vyp.1. S. 136–138. [in Ukrainian]
9. Cheremisin O.V. (2021). Dumska model mistsevoho samovriaduvannia yak politychnyi instytut pivdenoukrainskoho rehionu 1785–1870 rr. [The Duma model of local self-government as a political institution in the southern Ukrainian region, 1785–1870]. *Rozvytok suspilnykh nauk v suchasnykh umovakh: teoriia, metodolohiia, praktyka*. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim «Helvetyka», Vyp. 1. S. 63–66. [in Ukrainian]
10. Cheremisin O.V. (2020). Spetsialni ta dodatkovi podatky z miskoho naseleння Pivdnia Ukrainy u 1870–1917 rr. [Special and additional taxes on the urban population of southern Ukraine in 1870–1917]. *Kyivski istorychni studii* № 1. (10). S. 60–67. [in Ukrainian]

Date of initial submission: 09.01.2026
Date of acceptance after peer review: 13.03.2026
Publication date: 07.04.2026

Наукове видання

ПІВДЕННИЙ АРХІВ SOUTH ARCHIVE

(історичні науки)
(Historical Sciences)

Випуск — LIII
Issue

Дата розміщення онлайн: 07.04.2026. Дата друку: 14.04.2026.
Формат 60×84/8. Гарнітура Times New Roman.
Папір офсет. Цифровий друк. Ум. друк. арк. 5,58.
Замов. № 0326/265. Наклад 300 прим.

Видавництво і друкарня – Видавничий дім «Гельветика»
65101, м. Одеса, вул. Інглезі, 6/1
Телефон +38 (095) 934 48 28, +38 (097) 723 06 08
E-mail: mailbox@helvetica.ua
Свідоцтво суб'єкта видавничої справи
ДК № 7623 від 22.06.2022 р.