



KYIV-MOHYLA
HUMANITIES JOURNAL

KYIV-MOHYLA SCHOLARLY PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS

Hetmans' Land Donations to the Orthodox Church: Motives and Expectations

Author(s): Oksana Prokopyuk

Source: Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal 10 (2023): 170–191

Published by: National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

<http://kmhj.ukma.edu.ua/>

Hetmans' Land Donations to the Orthodox Church: Motives and Expectations*

Oksana Prokopyuk

National Preserve "Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra", Goethe University Frankfurt am Main

Abstract

Hetmans' donations to the Orthodox Church were characteristic of the religious and political culture of the Cossack state already in the era of its emergence in the mid-17th century. In addition to other gifts, hetmans confirmed or provided Orthodox monasteries with land ownership, which was at the center of identity, power, and social prestige. It is clear that certain concrete motives, expectations, and models of behavior stood behind the hetmans' donations of land.

This article suggests considering hetmans' donations of land to the Orthodox Church as an element of symbolic communication, in which the giver and the recipient interacted, built symbolic communicative ties, and produced centers of communication. The focus is on "communication through donations," that is, relationships of giving.

Religious motivations and the recognition of monasteries as powerful centers of prayer were determinative for the hetmans' "communication through donations" to the monasteries. The hetmans' giving land and other real estate to monasteries was based on "piety," but it was done in the name of Christ-loving rulers. So, in such donations it is quite natural that state interests were prevalent, but also there were complex combinations of religious, social, and political motivations and expectations. These characteristics were evident both in a general sense and in each specific instance of gifting.

Key Words: donation, communication, hetmans, Orthodox Church, 17th–18th centuries.



The giving of gifts to the Church, Catholic or Orthodox, characteristic of the religious culture of medieval or early modern Europe, was also set in the system of symbolic communication of the Cossack state, the Zaporizhzhian Host (Hetmanate), already in the era of its appearance in the mid-17th century.¹ The role of the most prominent

* This article was written during an internship as part of the research project "Polycentricity and Plurality of Premodern Christianities" (POLY), implemented with the support of the German Research Fund (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)) at Goethe University in Frankfurt am Main. The Gerda Henkel Foundation also provided financial support for the research work (project 19/FI/22).

1 Gifts in the sphere of social, political, and religious relationships in the Hetmanate have practically not been researched, although a rising interest in the theme has been observed in recent years: Oleksii Sokyrko, "Skilky koshtuie porozuminnia? 'Poklony' ta 'nakladky' v ukrainskykh sudakh pershoi chverti XVIII stolittia" ["How Much for the Agreement? 'Poklons' and 'Naklads' in the Ukrainian Courts of the early 18th century]," *SOTSIUM. Almanakh sotsialnoi istorii* 7 (2007): 195–209; Liliia Berezhna, "Dary

contributors, from whom monasteries and churches received various significant gifts, belonged, above all, to the rulers, the hetmans of the Zaporizhzhian Host. It is sufficient to recall well-known donations of hetmans to the sacristies of churches and monasteries, or churches built from hetmans' offerings or even entire monasteries.² What is essential, and I want to focus attention on this, is that the status of the ruler opened wide possibilities for giving the Orthodox Church land property, which was in the center of identity, power, and social prestige. The hetmans confirmed or gave a gift of sections of land to Orthodox monasteries, and even whole villages and other real estate like forests, lakes, mills, apiaries, and also the right to one's own industries: transportation across rivers, catching fish, production of mead, etc. These donations of hetmans to monasteries are well documented in *universals****, a significant body of which were published and are actively studied in terms of various themes and problems.³

Mazepy. Kultura podarunkiv ukrainskykh hetmaniv u systemi diplomatichnoi komunikatsii druhoi polovyny XVII stolittia" ["Mazepa's Gift. The Ukrainian Hetmans Culture of Presents in the System of Diplomatic Communication in the Second Part of 17th Century"], *Kyivska Akademiia* 12 (2014–2015): 222–40; Oksana Prokopyuk, "Vkladnyky monastyriv Hetmanshchyny: sotsialnyi portret" ["Donators of the Monasteries in the Hetmanshchyna: A Social Portrait"], *Ukrainian Historical Journal* 2 (2022): 30–45. At the same time, the theme of symbolic communication in the societies of early modern Europe has been actively developed in recent decades: Natalia Zemon Davis, *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France* (Oxford University Press, 2001); *Ibidem*, *Die schenkende Gesellschaft: zur Kultur der französischen Renaissance* (München: Beck; 1. Aufl. edition, 2002); *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, edited by Esther Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001); Aafke E. Komter, *Social Solidarity and the Gift* (Cambridge University Press, 2005); Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, "Symbolische Kommunikation in der Vormoderne. Begriffe – Thesen – Forschungsperspektiven," *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 31, no 4 (2004): 489–527; Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, *Rituale* (Frankfurt am Main: Beltz Druckpartner, Hemsbach, 2013); Arnoud-Jan A. Bijsterveld, *Do ut des. Gift giving, Memoria, and Conflict Management in the Medieval Low Countries* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2007); *Ibidem*, *Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft: Gabentausch und Netzwerkpfege im europäischen Mittelalter: Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums Munster, 19–20 November 2009*, hrsg. von Michael Grünbart (Münster, 2011); *A Companion to Death, Burial and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, c. 1300–1700*, edited by Philip Booth and Elizabeth Tingle (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2021).

2 In particular, donations to monasteries of the Hetmanate are most fully presented in the publication: *Ukraina – kozatska derzhava. Iliustrovana istoriia ukrainskoho kozatstva u 5175 fotosvitlynakh* [Ukraine is a Cossack state. Illustrated history of the Ukrainian Cossacks in 5175 photographs], eds. V. Nediak, V. Shcherbak, O. Fedoruk (Kyiv: Emma, 2007), 856–945.

** Universal (from the Latin *universalis* – general) is an administrative-political act which had the nature of a manifesto, issued by a hetman.

3 As part of the series "Universals of Ukrainian Hetmans. Materials for the Ukrainian "Dyplomatariiu," a fundamental publication of Hetman universals was made: *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho 1648–1657* [Universals of Bohdan Khmelnytskyi

Until now, hetmans' confirmation and granting of land has generally been viewed from the prospective of monasteries' land ownership or monasteries' economic interests, intending to increase their profits and material wealth. These questions are important and relevant, considering that the Church was a great landowner in the early modern era. However, it is hardly possible to explain the economic interests of the act of those who gave the gifts. The dimensions and also the high material value of land donations demonstrate not only their importance for the Church, but for the hetmans and Cossack state. Obviously, behind the donations stood entirely concrete expectations and models of behavior, both on the part of the hetmans and of the Church. The fundamental motive of donations to churches and monasteries was the concern for the salvation of one's soul through the prayers of the clergy for the donor. The monasteries receiving gifts were obliged to pray for the giver. In this way, a model of complex mutuality with a symbolic character was formed. In addition to religious motives, "communication through donations" could be complemented by social, economic, political, or even ideological interests and motivations. It is important to establish the spectrum of interests, motives, and expectations of hetmans and rulers of the Cossack state when they were giving the Church landed property. Did the hetmans give land and other real estate, and also the right to one's own industries, exclusively as owners, that is, public persons, or was there a manifestation of something private? To which monasteries did they give gifts and how did this affect the formation of ecclesiastical sacred or administrative centers? What did the monasteries do to obtain confirmations and gifts of real estate from hetmans?

The search for answers to these and similar questions requires updating the methodological toolkit for research. For a fairly long time now, historians, following anthropologists, have successfully studied gifts as symbolic markers which designate the rights and obligations of the parties in a complex system of mutual exchange, the participants of which have communicated, "spoken" through gifts.⁴ Furthermore, the concept of giving is applied, developed, and actively explored in the works of historians

1648–1657], edited: I. Krypiakievych, I. Butych (Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim "Alternatyvy", 1998), 1–416; *Universaly Ivana Mazepy. 1687–1709* [*Universals of Ivan Mazepa. 1687–1709*], edited I. Butych 1 (Kyiv; Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka u Lvovi, 2002), 1–780; *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv vid Ivana Vyhovskoho do Ivana Samoilovycha (1657–1687)* [*Universals of Ukrainian hetmans from Ivan Vyhovskyi to Ivan Samoilovych (1657–1687)*], edited: I. Butych, V. Rynsevych, I. Teslenko (Kyiv; Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka u Lvovi, 2004), 1–1118; *Universaly Ivana Mazepy. 1687–1709* [*Universals of Ivan Mazepa. 1687–1709*], edited: I. Butych, V. Rynsevych 2 (Kyiv; Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka u Lvovi, 2006), 1–799; *Universaly Pavla Polubotka (1722–1723)* [*Universals of Pavlo Polubotok*], edited V. Rynsevych (Kyiv: VIPOL, 2008), 1–721. At present, not all of the planned volumes of the hetmans' universals have been printed. Due to its sufficient representativeness and integrity, the already published body of documents served as the basis for this research.

4 Such an understanding of gift is emphasized in the works noted above (in footnote 1); the beginning was established by the work of French anthropologist Marcel Mauss, which has already become a classic in the theme of symbolic exchange: Marcel Mauss,

who research donations to churches and monasteries, above all in the medieval period.⁵ The search continues for theoretical foundations for further development of the problematic and of new contributions. This includes methodological approaches which understand Christianities as communities of exchange, but centers as social constructions which are formed where interactions intensify.⁶ It is precisely from such theoretical angles that I plan to consider hetmans' donations of land to the Orthodox Church as a component of a system of symbolic communication in which the donor and the recipient interacted, built symbolic communicative connections, and produced centers of communication. The focus is on "communication through donations," that is, relationships of giving. In perspective are responses to questions regarding hetmans' motives for donating land and other real estate to Orthodox monasteries and also questions regarding expectations connected with the giving of gifts.

Granting the Church rights of land ownership was not a new practice which arose in the Cossack state in the early modern era. Monasteries had long ago received land as a gift from rulers and wealthy representatives of the society or asked them to confirm what they had already acquired.⁷ In the mid-17th century, the land fund of monasteries looked fairly well formed. Researchers indicate that, in the first years after the Treaty of Pereiaslav, approximately 17% of land was found in the possession of the Orthodox Church.⁸ Of course, monastic land ownership suffered during Khmelnytskyi's epoch, and monasteries lost possessions on the Right Dnipro Bank, but they were able to compensate for these losses, in particular when taking into account the land given to them which had earlier belonged to the Catholic or Uniate churches and monasteries.⁹ Throughout the second half of the 17th until the first half of the 18th centuries, Orthodox monasteries were able to confirm and expand their land ownership. At the start of the 18th century, monastic holdings in Kyiv regiment,

"Essay sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques," *L'Année sociologique* 1 (1923–1924): 30–186.

- 5 How the conception of giving entered the work of historians studying donations to monasteries and churches is considered in detail in the article: Arnoud-Jan A. Bijsterveld, "The Medieval Gift as Agent of Social Bonding and Political Power: A Comparative Approach," in *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, edited by Esther Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001), 123–56.
- 6 This is related to the understanding of early modern Christianities as communities of interaction and the methodological approaches developed by the research group "Polycentricity and Plurality of Premodern Christianities" (POLY), Goethe University Frankfurt am Main (Germany). For more details see: https://www.geschichte.uni-frankfurt.de/92594738/Polycentricity_and_Plurality_of_Premodern_Christianities__POLY.
- 7 It is enough to recall the witness of the chronicles or of the Paterik of Kyivan Caves.
- 8 *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 7.
- 9 For example, the village of Mostyshche, which had belonged to the Dominicans, was given to Brotherly Epiphany Monastery in 1651, according to a hetman's universal: *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 116.

where the largest number of known monasteries were concentrated, composed 62% of the total land fund. In Chernihiv regiment, this number was even higher, 68%; in the Pereiaslav regiment, only 26%; and in Pryluky, Myrhorod, and Poltava even less.¹⁰ The practice of donating land in the Cossack state functioned successfully from Bohdan Khmelnytskyi to Danylo Apostol. However, already at the turn of the 17th and 18th centuries, the growth in monastic possession of land becomes a cause for concern among the Cossack Officers (*starshyna*), who started to see the Church as a competitor. The first allusions to certain restrictions related to the movement of tenants in monastery landholdings are recorded in the Kolomak Articles of 1687.¹¹ Finally, the Authoritative Ordinances of 1728 forbade granting lands to the Church. Monasteries and spiritual persons were forbidden to buy or accept land, arable land, and real estate as a donation and for the commemoration of the deceased from Cossacks and other secular persons.¹² The regulation of the growth of monastic landholdings was imposed by the initiative of Hetman Danylo Apostol and in the context of the general ordering of the land fund of the Hetmanate. It remains unclear whether a demand in the society of the Hetmanate for legal changes in the giving of land property already existed. Nevertheless, it is understood that the Kyivan Metropolitanate could not stay uninvolved with processes characteristic for eparchies of the Russian Empire, where active regulation of the practices of giving land had already started in the mid-16th century.¹³ In the 18th century, the state policy regarding church property evolved from the establishment of total control in the reign of Peter I to full secularization under Catherine II. Though delayed, the processes of general imperial unification did finally reach the Kyivan Metropolitanate.

It is not the giving of new land property or rights to monasteries, but the confirmation and defense of what a monastery had already earlier possessed or only received as a gift, for example, from the Cossack Officers or other landowners, that was covered by the majority of the hetmans' universals.¹⁴ Beginning in June 1648, Bohdan

10 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 26.

11 *Ibid.*, 52–53.

12 *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoj imperii s 1649 goda* [Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire since 1649] (St. Petersburg: Typ. II Otd. Sobstv. Ego Imp. Vel. Kanc., 1830), Vol. VIII, 75–82; “Universaly getmana Danila Apostola” [“Universals of Hetman Danylo Apostol”], in *Materialy dlia otechestvennoj istorii*, edited by M. O. Sudienko (Kiev: Univer. tip., 1853), vol. I, 70–71.

13 Stepan Veselovskii, “Monastyrskoe zemlevladienie v Moskovskoi Rusi vo vtoroj polovine XVI veka” [“Monastic land tenure in Muscovite Rus in the second half of the 16th century”], *Istoricheskie zapiski* 10 (1941): 101–14; Viacheslav Shaposhnik, “Prigovory o tserkovno-monastyrskom zemlevladienii v period pravleniia Ivana Groznogo” [“Verdicts on church and monastic land ownership during the reign of Ivan the Terrible”], *Khristianskoe chtenie* 3 (2012): 6–9.

14 For example: By his universal of 21 April 1670, Hetman Demian Mnohohrishnyi confirmed the right of the Lubny Mharsk monastery to a site near Lysa Hora, donated by the monk Rusynovych. On 24 September 1671, he granted a universal to the hegumen of Makoshyne Protection Monastery for a field and hayfield near

Khmelnyskyi published a number of universals in defense of the estates and land ownership of the Orthodox Church. Approximately 41% of the known universals by Khmelnyskyi were dedicated to church-related issues; generally, they addressed questions of the property rights of monasteries. Still, a small portion of the documents dealt with the giving of new lands or rights. According to researchers, from 1654 to 1657, 11 monasteries received at least 10 universals for new properties, 4 for arable land, and 8 for mills and mill wheels.¹⁵ A similar, small number of gifting universals and, at the same time, a high ratio of universals gifting to the Church were preserved until the rule of Ivan Samoilovych. According to approximate calculations, church-related issues were the central theme of 44% known universals by Ivan Vyhovskyi, 52% universals by Yurii Khmelnyskyi, 59%–by Pavlo Teteria, 52%–by Ivan Briukhovetskyi, 68%–by Petro Doroshenko, 45%–by Demian Mnohohrishnyi, 32%–by Ivan Samoilovych, 32%–by Ivan Mazepa, and 4%–by Pavlo Polubotok.¹⁶ A certain need exists to consider the specifics of the preservation of documents, since the majority of the preserved universals are connected precisely with the distribution of land and confirmation of property, less, for instance, with military issues.¹⁷ In any case, the above-given figures demonstrate very well the significant segment of church agenda in government policy and the active nature of communications between hetmans and the Church in the area of land ownership, certainly with a certain decrease by the end of the 17th century. At the same time, these figures do not necessarily indicate the typical level of activity for hetmans and the Church in general, and certainly not the generosity of hetmans. For, although the rulers of the Cossack state distributed land funds quite liberally, the development of Cossack land ownership gradually and objectively led to a decrease in the amount of lands which could be given into the ownership of monasteries.¹⁸ However, the possibility for choosing another type of

Makoshyne, received as a gift from Hryhorii Hulianytsky, a colonel of Nizhyn. On 19 June 1702, Hetman Ivan Mazepa confirmed the gifting of land from Colonel Mykhailo Myklashevskyi for Katoshynsk St. Nicholas Monastery. And by his universal on 18 September 1707, he confirmed a gift of Fr. Kornylo to Hlukhiv Petropavlivskyi Monastery of a forest, apiaries, and dams. For more details, see: *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 533–4, 560; *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 386–7, 512–3.

- 15 Valerii Smolii & Valerii Stepankov, “Derzhavna ekonomichna polityka ta stanovlennia natsionalnoi hospodarsko-ekonomichnoi modeli” [“State economic policy and formation of the national economic model”], in *Ukrainskyi Hetmanat: narysy istorii natsionalnoho derzhavotvorennia XVII–XVIII st.*, vol. 2 (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2018), 149, 152–3.
- 16 Here and further, the calculations or samples were conducted on the basis of a body of documents published as part of the series “Universals of Ukrainian hetmans. Materials for the Ukrainian “Dyplomatariiu.” For a full reference, see below.
- 17 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnyskoho*, 9
- 18 Valerii Smolii & Valerii Stepankov, “Ekonomika kozatskoi Ukrainy (1648–1676)” [“The Economy of Cossack Ukraine (1648–1676)”], in *Ekonomichna istoriia Ukrainy: Istoryko-ekonomichne doslidzhennia*, vol. 1 (Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr, 2011), 412–26.

donation always remained. For example, focusing on construction of churches, as Ivan Mazepa did.¹⁹

In the vast majority of universals, the hetmans were responding to the appeal of one monastery or another; that is, the Church was mostly the initiator of these relations. Under the conditions of war from 1648 to 1657, Orthodox monasteries had an objective need to seek defense from the hetman, inasmuch as they suffered from arbitrary handling of their real estate. The reason for hetmans to issue universals of confirmation might have been documents presented by a monastery regarding land ownership, verbal requests of monastic superiors to confirm the right to territory and arable land, or even a plea to take a monastery under protection. In the latter case, universals could begin with the words “we received a complaint” (*doshla do nas skarga*).²⁰ During the hetmancy of Khmelnytskyi, the universals aimed at legal regulation of issues arising in the area of monastic land ownership.²¹ The hetmans’ universals eventually evolved into security documents. Among the universals of Petro Doroshenko, defense universals for monasteries predominate. In these, he not only grants or confirms, but also takes under his protection, using phrases such as “taking under our defense” (*pod nashu vziavshi ohoronu*), “taking under our protection and defense” (*biruchi pod protektsiiu i oboronu svoiu*) for monks and monastic landholdings.²² Some universals emphasized the need to repair one monastery or another after military actions or helping monasteries resolve material problems: “We saw the great poverty of the monks of the monastery” (*vidiachy my velikiie nedostatki inokov monastira*).²³ The hetmans’ universals of a later time reveal the need of the monasteries for support. In 1699, Ivan Mazepa, confirming and granting new land holdings to St. Michael Golden-Domed Monastery, reasoned his action in the following way, “And seeing also poverty in everything at St. Michael’s Monastery, and willing that the praising of God not cease” (*a vidiachy tezh skudost vo vsem ubozhestvo monastira Mikhajlovskoho i hotiachi, abi hvala Bozhaia ne ustavala*).²⁴ It should be noted that hetmans’ universals were not detailed in their information on confirming or granting land ownership. They did not contain additional information regarding the time or conditions of land acquisition. This leads one to agree with the opinion that the questions of the legitimacy of the ways a monastery had received real estate did not arise, clearly, until the mid-18th century. Such matters did not provoke suspicions from the hetman or General Officer Staff (*Heneralna starshyna*) and did not require additional details from the monasteries.²⁵ Since the mid-17th century, enough reasons emerged

19 For the results of the latest attempts to count the number of churches built with the involvement of Hetman Ivan Mazepa, see: <http://www.mazepa.name/tserkovni-sporudy-shcho-buly-zbudovani-restavrovani-abo-ozdobleni-koshtom-i-mazepy/>.

20 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 124.

21 *Ibid.*, 26.

22 *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 398, 406–7, 436.

23 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 132, 137–8.

24 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 231–2.

25 Yuliia Rusakova, *Neavtentychni dokumenty Kyievo-Pecherskoho monastyria XVI–XVII st.: tekstolohiia i pozemelnyi aspekt pobutuvannia* [*Unauthentic documents of*

within the Church, leading to the custom of seeking confirmation or the granting of rights to real estate from hetmans. Prior to that, such requests were made to the previous owners or stewards of land funds.

Giving universals to monasteries, hetmans acted, above all, as rulers, defenders of the faith and of the Church. As the head of the state, the hetman had to take care of everything that fell under his authority. In the liberated territories, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi pursued the policy for protection of the life and property of various social groups, including the clergy. Starting with Bohdan Khmelnytskyi and then after him, hetmans clearly positioned themselves as defenders of the Orthodox faith. Such a policy was preceded by the long tradition of defending the Church, which dated back to the times of Petro Sahaidachnyi, when the Orthodox hierarchy was renewed with the help of the Cossacks in 1620.²⁶ Standing in defense of Holy Trinity Monastery in Hustyn, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, in a universal dated 2 July 1648, declared: "Since ancient times, we have bowed our heads before our Orthodox faith to preserve the houses of God" (*my ot davnykh chasov holovy svoi pokladaiem, za veru nashu pravoslavnuuiu i za tselost domov bozhiikh*).²⁷ The obligation of giving gifts to a monastery "having the authority in Little Russia to confirm all rights and establish rules" (*imeiuchi vlast v Maloi Rosii vsiakiie utverzhdati prava i ustroiivati poriadki*),²⁸ as part of the ruler's authority, is well documented in the universals of all hetmans, albeit with varying degrees of emphasis or activity. In the universal to the Pereiaslav cathedra regarding the granting of the village of Lialynets of 30 September 1701, Ivan Mazepa provided a comprehensive understanding of the ruler's obligation to make gifts to the Church: "We, as the hetman, in keeping with our ruling position, have to constantly not only take care of the integrity of the Little Russian homeland but also diligently and thoroughly care for the welfare of God's churches" (*izh my hetman, meiuchi po dolzhnosti nashei reimentarskoi, ne tolko o tselosti otchizny Malorosiiskoi neusyynii promisl, lech i o blahosostoianii tserkvei Bozhiikh horlivoie i revnostnoie popecheniie*).²⁹ He also emphasized this in a universal dated 10 September 1707 to Vydubytskyi St. Michael Monastery, regarding villages and farmsteads with adjoining arable lands.³⁰

It is clear that the monasteries of Kyiv and the whole Hetmanate actively took advantage of favorable political moods to confirm their rights and possessions in the

Kyiv-Pechersk Monastery in the 16th-17th centuries: textual criticism and land aspect of functioning] (dys. ... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.06) (Kyiv: M. S. Hrushevskyi Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2008), 161-2.

26 Petro Sas, "Vidnovlennia pravoslavnoi tserkovnoi ierarkhii Kyivskoi mytropolii (1620)" ["The Restoration of the Orthodox Church Hierarchy of the Kyiv Metropolitanate (1620)"], *Ukrainian Historical Journal* 4 (2010): 15-39.

27 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 78.

28 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 149-150. Similar basic statements are repeated in other universals, for example, see: *Ibid.*, 234-5.

29 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 2 (2006): 281-2.

30 *Ibid.*, 389-90.

Cossack state and, when possible, also try to secure the patronage of Russian monarchs. For example, the Kyivan Cave Monastery (or Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra), a famous shrine and a powerful monastery with stauropegial status which had opportunities to look for patrons outside the Hetmanate, periodically sent embassies of Lavra's senior monks to the tsar with the goal of confirming their property rights.³¹ However, the stabilization of the Cossack state and, particularly during the hetmanship of Ivan Mazepa, the hetman's support in advocating for stauropegial status inclined the Kyivan Cave Monastery to communicating with and searching for support among the political elite of the Hetmanate. Thus, Mazepa's universals include documents addressed to Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, something not observed under the previous leaders of the Cossack state.³²

For hetmans, it was important to stress in universals that they were acting as followers of the predecessors, such as princesses, kings, and nobility, that is, within an already-established tradition. Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, confirming an offering to monasteries, emphasized that he was observing the Polish kings and doing just the way they acted: "since ancient times, offerings have been given by pious benefactors, lords, and devout Christians to a holy place, and privileges have been confirmed by kings" (*z davnikh vekov ot pobozhnykh ktitorov, panov i khristiian blahocheistykh nadaniie i mescu sviatomu oferovaniie i ot korolev privileami stverdzhonyie*).³³ His universals clearly demonstrate the understanding of the inviolability of previous donations of land, the nature of the gift, and the symbolic connection of the giver and the recipient "given by pious benefactors for the remission of their sins... and now harm is being done to the souls of the pious benefactors" (*prez pobozhnykh ktitorov za otpushcheniie hrehhov est fundovanoie... ane tezh tiazhko dusham pobozhnykh ktitorov chinechi*).³⁴ Later, succeeding hetmans considered it sufficient to refer to Bohdan Khmelnytskyi as the founder of the Cossack state, "father of the homeland," and to their "antecessors." For example, Ivan Briukhovetskyi used such a formula when confirming the ownership of a number of villages by St. Nicholas Monastery in Baturyn on 10 May 1668: "<...> also looking at the universals of confirmation from our predecessor of glorious memory, the late Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, the hetman of the Zaporizhzhian Host, and our other predecessors, we turn our attention to them with this document of ours and also with our devotion" (*tezh pogliadaiuchi na potverzhalnyie uneveraly slavnoie pamiaty antecessora nashoho nebozhchika Bohdana Hmelnitskoho, hetmana Voisk Zaporozhskikh i innykh antecessorov nashikh, i k onim voliu nashu stosuiuchi, sim pisanem nashim,*

31 Yuliia Rusakova, *Neavtentychni dokumenty*, 69–70, 76–7. In addition to the descriptions of the sacristy of Dormition Cathedral, charters from the tsar were added to confirm the rights and ownership of the Kyivan Cave Monastery, a practice that began in the second half of the 18th century, see: National Preserve "Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra." KPL-A-945. Ark. 126–130; KPL-A-304. Ark. 255–260; KPL-A-1405. Ark. 1–7.

32 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 319, 394–5; 2 (2006): 257, 295, 359–61.

33 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 122, 123.

34 *Ibid.*, 192.

tezh s pobozhnosti nashoi).³⁵ We encounter similar wording in a number of universals by other hetmans.³⁶ In this way, granting land to a monastery, hetmans continued the practice of their predecessors, demonstrated their power, showed its “succession,” and confirmed the image of the ruler as a defender of the faith and the Church. Striving to present an exemplary model of behavior, the possessors of the hetman’s mace demonstrated their high status and membership in the cohorts of rulers.

Donations were to confirm the Christian virtues of the hetman as a good ruler for the image of the ruler as a person endowed with the highest Christian virtues demanded that hetmans demonstrate their “piety.”³⁷ Usually, “piety” was defined as the basic motive for giving donations in hetmans’ universals. “With our piety, we gave the village of Polove, which is located on the lands of Hustyn monastery, to Hustyn monastery” (*myz pobozhnosti nashoi selo Polovoie, stoiachoie na hruntakh monastyra Hustynskoho, ferovalismo ottsem v monastiru Hustynskom buduchim na vizhivlene*), as is written in the universal of Bohdan Khmelnytskyi to Holy Trinity Monastery in Hustyn of 16 May 1655.³⁸ Bohdan Khmelnytskyi’s son, Yurii Khmelnytskyi, in his universals constantly emphasized the “piety” of his father. Hetman Petro Doroshenko even in universals of defense stated that he confirmed ownership or the placing of a monastery under his protection because of his “piety.”³⁹ We meet similar formulas in universals of other hetmans too.⁴⁰ The hetman should care for the Church, maintain holy places in an appropriate condition, and take care of the material side of their life, above all, as a good Christian. The universal of Hetman Ivan Briukhovetskyi of 12 March 1664 regarding the confirmation of property of Lubny Mharsk Transfiguration Monastery, emphasizes this well: “It is the Christian obligation itself which demands of all us, Orthodox Christians, that monasteries and holy places not be destroyed through these willful people” (*samaia hristiianskaia povinnost toho po nas vsekh, pravovernykh khristiianakh, vystiagaiet, aby obitele i mesta sviatyie chrez svoikh zhe svoievolykh liudej do znishchenia ne prikhodili*).⁴¹ On 9 February 1688, Ivan Mazepa issued a universal for Mezhyhiria Savior-Transfiguration Monastery to confirm its ownership of lands bought and given by pious benefactors and previous hetmans: “<...> from our Christian obligation, so that the brothers of the monastery under the rule of our

35 *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 366.

36 *Ibid.*, 402–3, 404, 405, 411–2, 518–9, and others.

37 Natalia Yakovenko, “Hospodari vitchyzny’: uivlennia kozatskoi ta tserkovnoi elity Hetmanatu pro pryrodu, reprezentatsiiu i oboviazky vlady (do pochatku XVIII stolittia)” [“Masters of the Fatherland’: the idea of the Cossack and church elite of the Hetmanate about the nature, representation and duties of power (till the beginning of the 18th century)”], in Natalia Yakovenko, *Mirrors of Identity. Studies in the History of Concepts and Ideas in Ukraine (16th through the Early 18th Century)* (Kyiv: Laurys, 2012), 414.

38 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 166.

39 For example: *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 423.

40 *Ibid.*, 493–4, 502–3, 505, 533, 666–7; *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 135–6.

41 *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 316.

hetmancy know no violation of their properties, and in general for the multiplication of the praise of God, that this holy place, after much damage by the military, may be more and more extended” (*z povinnosti nashei khristiianskoi... bratiia meshkaiuchaia, za reimentu nasheho hetmanskoho v svoikh dobrakh zhadnoho narushenia ne uznavali, a ovshem dlia pomnozhenia hvaly Bozhoi toie sviatoie mesto po mnogikh ruinakh voiennykh, v bolshuiu shchoraz obfymost rozshirialosia*).⁴²

In the understanding of the early modern Christians, monastic property, land, and the property rights of monasteries made it possible for the monks to execute their main obligation—constant prayer. Supporting the material needs of the monasteries aimed to encourage an increase in the number of monks and the monks’ concentration on spiritual pursuits. Monasteries’ collective wealth did not conflict with monastic ascetic ideals; rather, they united the idea of material and spiritual welfare. This meaning for hetmans’ donations is present in universals in the formula “for the constant praise of God in daily prayers” (*dlia ustavichnoi v molitvakh shchodennykh khvaly Bozhoi*), which is mentioned in Ivan Mazepa’s universal to Hlukhiv Petropavlivskiy Monastery of 11 October 1687.⁴³ Behind the essentially material component of the gifts, the more important, the sacred, was hidden. Giving a gift to one church or another, the donor chose a place where prayers would be said for him, where they would “professionally” be concerned for the salvation of his soul. In turn, monasteries took such commemoration as one of their priority tasks. To confirm this, it is sufficient to recall the numerous prefaces in memorials which emphasized the necessity to constantly pray for the dead.⁴⁴

In universals for monasteries which pertained to confirmation or defense, hetmans appeared to formalize the pre-existing agreement between the giver and the recipient. Accordingly, they were limited in their possibilities to build their own symbolic contacts with a monastery. It is noticeable that we can “see” hetmans in universals related to donations, in which they act as one party in an agreement with the Church, because they independently donated real estate to monasteries. As a consequence of hetmans’ gifting universals, a symbolic connection with the monastery should have been established, in which, from the moment of receiving the donation, the monks took responsibility to pray for the giver. Hetmans’ universals speak of the residents of monasteries as “those who pray to God for them” (*iako bohomoltsov svoikh*). And perhaps most important here is the following observation. Hetmans’ universals speak not of personal prayer for the hetman, but of corporate prayer, for the hetman and the Zaporizhzhian Host.⁴⁵ Hetmans’ donations of land

42 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 121–2.

43 *Ibid.*, 99.

44 Institute of Manuscripts. F. 307. № 537п/1743. Ark. 2–3; № 538п/1744. Ark. 3–4 3B.; F. 312. № 376c/373. Ark. 1–5; National Preserve “Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra”. KPL-Kn-907. Ark. 1–1 zv.; KPL-Kn-2080. Ark. 2–2 zv.; KPL-Kn 858. Ark. 2–3; KPL-Kn 856. Ark. 3–3 zv.; KPL-Kn 2091. Ark. 2–3.

45 In the same way, the universals entitled the hetmans as “the hetman with the Zaporizhzhian Host.” *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 16–8.

are gifts of the ruler, moreover, the ruler elected by the Zaporizhzhian Host. Corresponding testimonies literally permeate the universals of hetmans concerning gifts; particularly frequent is the use of the following formulas: “they do not forget the Zaporizhzhian Host in their daily prayers” (*v schodennikh molitvakh svoikh i Voiska Zaporozskoho ne zabivaiut*); “praises to God are given daily for us and the whole Zaporizhzhian Host” (*shchodenne za nas i vseie Voisko Zaporozhskoie otdaietsia khvala Bozhiia*); “for God’s praise and for the remission of our sins, and for the whole Zaporizhzhian Host” (*dlia khvaly Bozhei i dlia otpushchenia hrekhov nashikh, yako i vseho Voiska Zaporozkoho*); “for the remission of our sins and for the whole Zaporizhzhian Host” (*za otpushcheniie hrekhov nashikh i vseho Voiska Zaporozskoho*); “so that Father Hegumen and his brother monks pray to the Lord God for us and for the whole Zaporizhzhian Host” (*zheby tak za nas, yako i vse Voisko Zaporozkoie Hospoda Boha velebnyi otets ihumen z bratieiu svoieiu inokami blahal*) and others.⁴⁶ All the given quotes containing prayers for the hetman and the Zaporizhzhian Host or the remission of the sins of the hetman and the Zaporizhzhian Host, which, essentially, also indicated prayer, underline the communal nature of the donation of the hetman and the Cossacks, who made the gift together and thus together claimed a symbolic connection with a monastery. This illustrates well the idea of power and the political culture in the Hetmanate, where the concept of “correct” power, above all, was associated with the collective will of the army.⁴⁷

In certain periods of the Cossack state rule, the prayer formula could be extended by adding the Muscovite tsars. A mention of the tsar is thus recorded in the universals of Ivan Briukhovetskyi: “with Christian piety, for the remission of the sins of the tsar’s bright majesty and the whole Zaporizhzhian Host” (*z pobozhnosti khrestiianskoi, dlia otpushcheniia hrekhov iego tsarskoho svetloho velichestva i vseho Voiska Zaporozkoho*); “so that the praise of God be increased, and for many years of health for the noble heirs of the tsar’s bright majesty and for the whole Zaporizhzhian Host an offering, so that daily prayers be said in this holy place” (*zhebi khvala Bozhiia brala pomnozhenie, a za iego tsarskoho presvetloho velichestva blahorodnykh naslednikov mnogoletnoie zdorovie i za vse Voisko Zaporozskoie ofera i molitvi shchodenniie otpravovani na tom mestcu sviatom byli*).⁴⁸ The expansion of the prayer formula was apparently a manifestation of Briukhovetskyi’s political inclinations and his dependence on the authority of Moscow, and it also demonstrated an acceptance of the limits of his power. Hetman Demian Mnohohrishny also mentioned the tsar in certain later universals: “so that they beseech the majesty of the Almighty for the dignity of the tsar’s bright majesty and for us and for the whole Zaporizhzhian Host in bloodless sacrifices for the remission of sins” (*zheby za dostoinstvo eho tsarskoho presvetloho velichestva i za nas i vse Voisko Zaporozkoie v bezkrovnykh oferakh maiestat vyshneho o odpushcheniie hrekhov*

46 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 132, 176–7, 192–3, 211, 236; *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 56, 64–5, 68, 78, 80, 92–93, 408–9, 419, 426, 433, 437.

47 Natalia Yakovenko, “Hospodari vitchyzny,” 426.

48 *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 304, 346, 349.

molitstvoval); “we with Christian piety and our special obligation, making efforts so that the praise of God be increased in holy monasteries, and most of all for many happy years of the rule of the tsar’s bright majesty and also for our health and that of the whole Zaporizhzhian Host near God’s holy altar to praise His holy majesty” (*my z pobozhnosti khristiianskoi i z osoblivoi povinnosti nashoi, dokladaiuchi starania, aby sia Bozhaia v obiteliakh sviatykh mnozhila khvala, a naibarzei aby za shchaslivoie panovanie i mnoholetnoie eho tsarskoho presvetloho velichestva tudezh nashoie i vseho Voiska Zaporozkogo zdorovia u prestola Bozhoho maiestat eho sviatii khvalili*).⁴⁹ We also find a corresponding prayer in the universals of Ivan Samoilovych: “appealing to the piety of our predecessors and so that the praise of God not cease but only increase, and also for the dignity of our great ruler, the tsar’s bright majesty, and for the Zaporizhzhian Host and our health... that daily near the altar of God they beseech His holy majesty” (*do toei zhe i onykh antecessorov nashykh stosuiuchisia pobozhnosti i aby khvala Bozhaia dlia obfetosti ne ustavala, ale zheby tak barzei mnozhilasia, a eshche by za dostoinstvo velikoho hosudaria nashoho eho tsarskoho presvetloho velichestva, za Voiska Zaporozhskoho i nashoie zdorovie, i dobra pospolitaho tselost, shchodenne u prestola Bozhoho maiestat eho sviatii blahaly*)⁵⁰ and of Ivan Mazepa: “and seeing deficiency and poverty in everything at St. Michael’s Monastery and desiring that God’s praise not cease, that prayer constantly be said with bloodless sacrifices for our great ruler, for us, the hetman and the whole Zaporizhzhian Host” (*a vidiachy tezh skudost vo vsem ubozhestvo monastira Mikhailovskoho i khotiachi, abi khvala Bozhaia ne ustavala i molitva za velikoho hosudaria nashoho, za nas, hetmana, i vse Voisko Zaporozhskoie vsehdashnaia pri bezkrovnikh oferakh otpravlialos*).⁵¹ Against the background of the regular record in the universals, alongside the hetman of the Zaporizhzhian Host, separate mentioning of the tsar of Moscow, the occasional presence of which, most of all, essentially depended on the personal factor or concrete situation.

In the understanding of contemporaries, the hetman, as the head of the state, had to put service “of the public good” as a value higher than his private interests and be a defender “of the public good,”⁵² as we can see in the religious sphere, too. Still, was there in hetmans’ land donations to monasteries a place to reveal something private? Yes, but to a small extent. Pavlo Teteria on 18 May 1658 donated his manor in the village of Popivtsi, a forest, and hayfields to the Mezhyhiria Savior-Transfiguration Monastery for the remission of his sins. However, at that time, he was not a hetman yet and acted exclusively as a private person.⁵³ Among all the varieties of hetmans’ universals, only in those issued by Ivan Mazepa do we find literally a few instances where the hetman personally donated real estate to monasteries. Thus, on 17 July 1694, Ivan Mazepa gave two mills, which he had built at his own expense, to the Chernihiv archbishopric:

49 Ibid., 479, 491–2, 504–5, 546, 546–7, 561–2.

50 Ibid., 624–5, 464, 659.

51 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 231–2.

52 Natalya Yakovenko, “Hospodari vitchyzny,” 414.

53 *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 219–20.

“Having concern for my soul, now during my life with good will and healthy thoughts as my own grounds” (*maiuchi ia popecheniie o dushe moei, teper za zhivota moiego z dobroj vole i zdorovoho rozmisku vlasni moi kgrunta*).⁵⁴ On 16 May 1699, by another universal, Ivan Mazepa confirmed the purchase of a mill, field, and hayfields for the Monastery of the Domnytsia Nativity of the Mother of God: “We, the hetman, out of our Christian piety, in the place which is called Domnytsia, in the Chernihiv regiment, through the month of March, in which the wonder-working image of the Most Holy Mother of God appeared and gave healing to many people, at our own cost are building a church in honor of the Nativity of the Most Holy Mother of God, from the same foundation building a monastery for our salvation” (*izh my, hetman s pobozhnosti nashoi Khristianskoi, na mestsu, prozivaemom Dumnytsa, v polku Chernehovskom, protivu mesta Bereznoi lezhacham, na kotorom novoivavilsia chudovnyi presviatyia bohoroditsy obraz i mnohim podaiet liudem istseleniia, vlasnim svoim koshtom postanovivshi tserkov vo imia Rozhdestva presviatyia bohoroditsy, iz samoho fundamentu postroivshi monastyr, yako dlia spaseniia svoieho*).⁵⁵ The universals concerning private donations of land or other real estate emphasize that they were issued at the personal expense of the donor. Such documents include texts exclusively about the salvation of the donor’s soul.

However, except for these few documents, in all other instances, the hetmans confirmed or granted land to monasteries on behalf of themselves and the Zaporizhzhian Host. In such universals, we may notice individual manifestations of the private. Thus, Hetman Ivan Samoilovych, considering his descent from a priestly family, granted a significant number of rights to his estates and other real estate to the white clergy. Ivan Mazepa personally supported the Ascension Caves Monastery, and also Hlukhiv Dormition Monastery, where his mother, Maria Mahdalena Mazepa, was a nun, and later the hegumena. The hetman explicitly indicated his filial obligation several times in universals: “And so to our dear mother we fulfill a just request and in our filial humility we confirm it with this universal” (*tak i ei mylosty, roditelki nashoi, prosheniuu slushnomu vihozhaiuchi nashoho sinovskoho povolnostiu stverzhaiem sim uneverсалom*).⁵⁶ He issued universals both for monasteries and personally for Hegumena Mahdalena.⁵⁷ Personal connections and the hetmans’ circle of contacts, which also included the black clergy, the intellectual elite of the time, played quite a significant role in the “communication through donations.” It is known that Ivan Mazepa helped Dymytrii Rostovskyi renew Hlukhiv Petropavlivskyi Monastery and helped Feodosii Uhlytsky rebuild Vydubtskyi St. Michael Monastery and monasteries of the Chernihiv eparchy.⁵⁸ Without a doubt, Ivan Mazepa’s donations to Kyivan monasteries were influenced by his relations with the highest Church representatives like Varlaam

54 *Universalny Ivana Mazepy*, 2 (2006): 180.

55 *Ibid.*, 1 (2002): 324–5.

56 *Ibid.*, 106–7.

57 *Ibid.*, 106–7, 123–4, 144–5, 242.

58 Yuriy Mytsyk, “Hetman Ivan Mazepa yak pokrovytel Pravoslavnoi tserkvy” [“Hetman Ivan Mazepa as a patron of the Orthodox Church”], *Siverianskyi litopys* 6 (2006): 39.

Yasynskiy, Ioasaf Krokovskiy, Stefan Yavorskyy, Zakhariia Kornylivych, and Innokentii Monastyrskyy. Manifestations of private matters in hetmans' universals witness to a religious sensibility and demonstrate personal spiritual priorities. Thus, Ivan Mazepa privately asked for prayers "for himself" from Domnytsia Nativity of the Mother of God Monastery, a local shrine newly built with his active participation. Nevertheless, whether donating land or other real estate, hetmans acted, first of all, as pious, Christ-loving rulers. So, as a ruler, Ivan Mazepa made gifts, above all, to Kyivan monasteries, but also to other monasteries of the Hetmanate, expecting that in all those places they would pray for him and the Zaporizhzhian Host.

By their donations to monasteries, hetmans interacted with monasteries and thus fostered the creation of ecclesiastical sacred and administrative centers. Foremost among these was inarguably Kyiv, which, despite not becoming the capital of the Cossack state, still played the role of a spiritual, ecclesiastical, and intellectual center of a supraregional importance. The hetmans considered Kyiv the most expedient place to deal with religious, social, and political interests all at the same time. Kyivan monasteries, as places of particular holiness, were well suited for the fulfillment of, first of all, religious needs. Many considered it worthwhile to have a spiritual connection with the Kyivan monasteries for the salvation of their souls. Equally significant, the hetmans made gifts to Kyivan monasteries for political reasons. Political motivations are particularly evident in the hetmans' efforts to give due honor to the glory to Kyiv, as an important symbolic and spiritual center. In the first third of the 17th century, this concept of Kyiv was crystallized and continued up till the beginning of the 18th century, in particular owing to the mythology of "Kyiv as the second Jerusalem,"⁵⁹ formulated by Kyivan intellectuals. A significant part of the hetmans' universals involved Kyivan monasteries, although the hetmans' favor was not the same for all the monasteries of Kyiv.

The list of monasteries receiving gifts was different for each holder of the hetman's mace. Thus, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi addressed universals to Mezhyhiria Savior-Transfiguration, Pustynno-Mykolayivskyy, St. Michael Golden-Domed, Brotherly Epiphany, Vydubyskyi St. Michael, Ascension Caves, and Florovskyy in Podil monasteries.⁶⁰ Such a wide scope and interest in Kyivan monasteries was consistent with the hetmans' desire to secure the Church's support and their efforts to insure for themselves the loyalty of ecclesiastical elites, also including the goal of legitimizing their own power.⁶¹ Later, the common attention of the hetmans focused on Pustynno-Mykolayivskyy Monastery. There was also a significantly noticeable interest in the stauropelial Mezhyhiria Savior-Transfiguration Monastery and Florovsky Convent in

59 For more details, see: Volodymyr Rychka, "Kyiv – druhyi Yerusalym" (z istorii politychnoi dumky ta ideolohii serednovichnoi Rusi) ["Kyiv is the second Jerusalem" (from the history of political thought and ideology of Medieval Rus)] (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2005); Serhii Plokhyy, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Oxford University Press, 2001), 263–4.

60 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 26–8.

61 Serhii Plokhyy, *The Cossacks and Religion*, 248–9.

Podil. After Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Kyivan monasteries obtained more universals only from Ivan Mazepa.⁶² Furthermore, Ivan Mazepa included the Kyivan Cave Monastery in the orbit of his interests. Later, Ivan Skoropadskyi managed to support such interaction. This was a great achievement for his reputation, a notable signal for the strengthening of the Cossack state, and preparation for strong cooperation with the Church. It is also worthwhile to view the confirmation and granting of property rights to St. Sophia Cathedral, the Kyivan cathedral, and Metropolitan of Kyiv Varlaam Yasynovskiy⁶³ in the context of a distinct vector of Ivan Mazepa's policy. The presentation of land donations to these church structures, which represented the administrative ecclesiastical center with the metropolitan see, together with the rebuilding of St. Sophia Cathedral and the renewal of the Pereiaslav-Boryspil eparchy, became elements of one grand political project of Ivan Mazepa to strengthen and revive the Kyivan Metropolitanate. Still, behind separate gifts of land to the Pereiaslav-Boryspil eparchy, Ivan Mazepa's ambitious plans to extend his power to the Right Bank were obviously concealed.

	Bohdan Khmelnytskyi	Ivan Vyhovskyi	Yurii Khmelnytskyi	Ivan Briukhovetskyi	Pavlo Teteria	Petro Doroshenko	Demian Mnohohrishnyi	Ivan Samoiloivych	Ivan Mazepa
Kyivan Cave Monastery***									+
Mezhyhiria Savior-Transfiguration Monastery	+	+	+				+	+	+
Pustynno-Mykolaivsky Monastery	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+
St. Michael Golden-Domed Monastery	+						+	+	+
Brotherly Epiphany Monastery	+						+	+	+
St. Sophia Cathedral			+						+
Vydubtskyi St. Michael Monastery	+	+	+			+			+
Petropavlivskyi Monastery									+
Ascension Caves Monastery	+					+			+
Florovskyi Convent in Podil	+		+		+	+	+	+	+

By building symbolic prayerful connections with sacred Kyiv, the hetmans sought the support of the ecclesiastical elite and expected the Church to legitimize their power. This was particularly important for Khmelnytskyi in the time when the Cossack state appeared and for Mazepa in the time of its strengthening. However, it can be admitted that in the whirlpool of dramatic wartime events of the middle and the second half of the 17th century, the Church maintained a relatively reserved stance

62 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 26–9.

63 For example, universals for the town of Bilohorodok of 2 May 1691, but dated in July of that year, were for a number of villages, including Koiliv: *Ibid.*, 221, 229–32, 235–6.

*** The table indicates which Kyivan monastery received universals concerning land possession and from which hetman. It was prepared based on a collection of documents published as part of the series “Universals of Ukrainian Hetmans. Materials for the Ukrainian “Dyplomatariiu.” See above for the full reference.

towards forming an alliance with the hetman's authority.⁶⁴ It seems that the interest in Kyiv was favorably balanced within the bounds of private religious needs, the need for a public expression of religiosity, and the place in the ecclesiastical sphere for addressing political interests.

With all the importance of Kyiv, none of the hetmans, in making a gift of land, looked exclusively at Kyivan monasteries, but demonstrated a vision of the wide sacred panorama of the Hetmanate. Monasteries outside Kyiv received a significant part of the hetmans' land affirmations and gifts. Making such gifts, and thus interacting with the monasteries of the Hetmanate, the hetmans in this way were involved in creating local sacred centers. Bohdan Khmelnytskyi donated land to Hustyn Holy Trinity, Lubny Mharsk Transfiguration, Maksaky Transfiguration, Baturyn St. Nicholas, and Hadiach St. Nicholas monasteries.⁶⁵ The universals of hetmans Ivan Vyhovskyi, Yurii Khmelnytskyi, Pavlo Teteria, and Petro Doroshenko extended to the land ownership of monasteries not only on the Left but also on the Right Dnipro Bank. In particular, there are universals from Ivan Vyhovskyi to Kaniv Protection Monastery and ascribed to the Kyivan Cave Monastery and Ombysk Monastery; from Yurii Khmelnytskyi and Pavlo Teteria to Kaniv Protection Monastery and Medvediv St. Nicholas Monastery; and from Petro Doroshenko to Kaniv Protection Monastery, Lebedyn Pustynno-Mykolayivskyi Monastery, Lebedyn St. George's Monastery, Trakhtemyriv Dormition Monastery, and Lysianka Holy Trinity Monastery. Petro Doroshenko mostly made donations to monasteries on the Right Bank of the Dnieper river. After the expansion of his power onto the Left Bank, he also issued a number of universals granting land ownership to the most notable Left Bank religious communities, such as Hustyn Holy Trinity, Baturyn St. Nicholas, Hlukhiv Petropavlivskyi, Poltava Exaltation of the Cross, and Luben Mharsk Transfiguration monasteries. The last monastery on this list enjoyed the patronage of almost all the hetmans. Thus, little is known about the relations of Yakym Somko with sacred Kyiv. However, two out of his three known universals were related to the Luben Mharsk Transfiguration Monastery. It can be assumed that the memory of the monastic efforts of Yurii Khmelnytskyi, who was a monk of this monastery in 1663, may have played a certain role. However, a number of other factors had a more immediate influence, including the efforts of this monastery to establish connections with the Cossack elite. Only single universals addressed to two Kyivan monasteries and issued by Ivan Briukhovetskyi and Pavlo Teteria are known, while their communication with monasteries outside Kyiv was significantly more active. Demian Mnohohrishnyi and Ivan Samoilovych exclusively donated to monasteries on the Left Bank within the territory of the state they governed. As for Hetman Ivan

64 Andrii Bovhyria, "Kozatske istoriopysannia: viziiia mynuloho y konstruiuvannia identychnosti v Hetmanshchyni XVII–XVIII st." ["Cossack historiography: the vision of the past and the construction of identities in the Hetmanate of the 17th–18th centuries"], in *Ukrainska derzhava druhoi polovyny XVII–XVIII st.: polityka, suspilstvo, kultura* (Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2014), 590–1.

65 *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho*, 26–8.

Mazepa, he pursued “communication through donations” with perhaps the largest number of monasteries.⁶⁶

	Bohdan Khmelnytskyi	Ivan Vyhovskiy	Yurii Khmelnytskyi	Ivan Briukhovetskyi	Pavlo Teteria	Petro Doroshenko	Demian Mnohohryshnyi	Ivan Samoilovych	Ivan Mazepa
Hlukhiv Petropavlivskiy Monastery****		+				+	+	+	+
Hlukhiv Dormition Monastery									+
Chernihiv Yelets Dormition Monastery							+	+	+
Chernihiv St. Paraskeviia Monastery		+	+	+			+	+	+
Pechenyky Dormition Monastery									+
Kozelets St. George Monastery									+
Kozelets Holy Trinity Monastery		+	+						
Velyki Budyshcha Transfiguration Monastery									+
Baturyn Novomlynsk Monastery				+			+	+	+
Baturyn St. Nicholas Monastery	+	+	+			+	+	+	+
Nizhyn Nativity of the Mother of God Monastery		+	+	+			+	+	
Nizhyn Krasnoostrivsk Monastery							+	+	+
Makoshyne Transfiguration Monastery							+	+	+
Makoshyne St. Nicholas Monastery				+			+	+	
Maksaky Transfiguration Monastery	+			+			+	+	+
Poltava Exaltation of the Cross Monastery						+	+	+	+
Hadiach Krasnohirsk St. Nicholas Monastery	+								+
Hustyn Holy Trinity Monastery	+	+		+		+	+	+	+
Lubny Mharsk Transfiguration Monastery	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Novhorod-Siversk Savior-Transfiguration Monastery							+	+	+
Pereiaslav Holy Ascension Cathedral									+
Domnytsia Nativity of the Mother of God Monastery									+
Kamiansk Dormition Monastery									+
Rykhliv St. Nicholas Monastery							+	+	
Kaniv Protection Monastery		+	+		+	+			
Medvedivka St. Nicholas Monastery			+		+				
Ombysh Nativity of the Mother of God Monastery		+							
Lebedyn St. Nicholas Hermitage Monastery						+			
Lebedyn St. George Monastery						+			
Trakhtemyriv Dormition Monastery						+			
Lysianka Holy Trinity Monastery						+			

66 *Universaly Ivana Mazepy*, 1 (2002): 26–9.

**** The table indicates which non-Kyivan monastery obtained universals regarding land possession and from which hetman. It was prepared based on a collection of documents published as part of the series “Universals of Ukrainian Hetmans. Materials for the Ukrainian “Dyplomatariiu.” See above for the full reference.

The topography of land donations granted by hetmans demonstrates the absence of Kyiv-centered attitude. Instead, it reflects an interest in several local sacred centers. The hetmans' donations hence fostered the creation of a polycentric sacred space, while simultaneously recognizing Kyiv as the "super-center." The realm of the hetmans' communication with the monasteries covered the whole Hetmanate, although generally concentrated on the territories of the Kyiv and Chernihiv regiments. So, the attention to the Chernihiv eparchy, besides Kyiv, can be observed⁶⁷. As the second largest city after Kyiv, it suffered less damage and was located near the administrative centers of the Cossack state. From a political perspective, gifts to the monasteries of the Hetmanate served as particular markers of the boundaries of the hetmans' power; most probably, they aimed at promoting its confirmation in places acknowledged by gifts. Also, the demand for local sacred centers may have been conditioned by the needs of private religiosity or private interests of another nature.

Decisive in the hetmans' "communication through donations" with monasteries were religious motives and the recognition of monasteries as powerful centers of prayer. Through the mediation of gifts, a symbolic and prayerful connection was established between the giver and the recipient, seeking salvation. The universals reveal that the prayers were not expected to be exclusively for the hetman, but for both the hetman and the Zaporizhzhian Host, as the status of the ruler demanded this. The donations "worked" for social prestige and the hetman's positive image in the Hetmanate's circles, which, in general, were inclined towards giving alms and charity. Donations of land produced important reputational and symbolic dividends for a hetman in the social and political spheres. Making a gift to the Church, the hetman "showed" that he was a good Christian, and so a good head of the state. Such a model of behavior was justified by the Church, established by predecessors, and expected in society. There are no grounds to claim that gifts to Orthodox monasteries contributed to the formation of the hetman's power. Similar motivations were relevant for rulers of the earlier European Middle Ages, although they became less prominent in the later period. However, the early modern Cossack state needed to address the Church and monasteries and interact with them through gifts, inasmuch as the political meaning of the ecclesiastical sphere remained significant. Just as monasteries sought protection under the hetman's mace, the hetmans also needed to support the Church to legitimize and strengthen their own power. In a direct sense, giving land, especially to non-Kyivan monasteries, marked the boundaries and sphere of power of the Cossack leaders. Donations to separate monasteries reflected the vectors of ecclesiastical policy. For example, through gifts to

67 For example, on 25 March 1677, Ivan Samoilovych gave the village of Kladkivka to Chernihiv Archbishop Lazar Baranovych: *Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv*, 718–9 and others.

Kyivan monasteries, in particular St. Sophia Cathedral, we can observe intricate political maneuvers aimed at strengthening the Kyivan Metropolitanate. In this way, hetmans' gifts of land and other real estate to monasteries were based on "piety" but carried out in the name of Christ-loving rulers. So, in such donations it is quite natural that state interests were prevalent, but also there were complex combinations of religious, social, and political motivations and expectations. These characteristics were evident both in a general sense and in each specific instance of gifting.

Bibliography

- A Companion to Death, Burial and Remembrance in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe, c. 1300–1700*, edited by Philip Booth and Elizabeth Tingle. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2021.
- Berezhna, Liliia. "Dary Mazepy. Kultura podarunkiv ukrainskykh hetmaniv u systemi dyplomatychnoi komunikatsii druhoi polovyny XVII stolittia" ["Mazepa's Gift. The Ukrainian Hetmans Culture of Presents in the System of Diplomatic Communication in the Second Part of 17th Century"]. *Kyivska Akademiia* 12 (2014–2015): 222–40.
- Bijsterveld, Arnoud-Jan A. "The Medieval Gift as Agent of Social Bonding and Political Power: A Comparative Approach." In *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Context*, edited by Esther Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong, 123–56. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001.
- — —. *Do ut des. Gift giving, Memoria, and Conflict Management in the Medieval Low Countries*. Hilversum: Verloren, 2007.
- Bovhyria, Andrii. "Kozatske istoriopyssannia: viziia mynuloho i konstruiuvannia identychnosti v Hetmanshchyni XVII–XVIII st." ["Cossack historiography: the vision of the past and the construction of identities in the Hetmanate of the 17th–18th centuries"]. In *Ukrainska derzhava druhoi polovyny XVII–XVIII st.: polityka, suspilstvo, kultura*, 586–628. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2014.
- Davis, Natalia Z. *Die schenkende Gesellschaft: zur Kultur der französischen Renaissance*. München: Beck; 1. Aufl. edition, 2002.
- — —. *The Gift in Sixteenth-Century France*. Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Geschenke erhalten die Freundschaft: Gabentausch und Netzwerkpflge im europäischen Mittelalter*: Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums Munster, 19–20 November 2009, hrsg. von Michael Grünbart. Münster, 2011.
- Komter, Aafke E. *Social Solidarity and the Gift*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Mauss, Marcel. "Essay sur le don. Forme et raison de l'échange dans les sociétés archaïques." *L'Année sociologique* 1 (1923–1924): 30–186.
- Medieval transformations: texts, power, and gifts in context*, edited by Esther Cohen and Mayke B. de Jong. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 2001.
- Mytsyk, Yurii. "Hetman Ivan Mazepa yak pokrovytel Pravoslavnoi tserkvy" ["Hetman Ivan Mazepa as a patron of the Orthodox Church"]. *Siverianskyi litopys* 6 (2006): 38–46.
- Plokhyy, Serhii. *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*. Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii s 1649 goda* [Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire since 1649]. Vol. VIII. St. Petersburg: Typ. II Otd. Sobstv. Ego Imp. Vel. Kanc., 1830.
- Prokopyuk, Oksana. "Vkladnyky monastyriv Hetmanshchyny: sotsialnyi portret" ["Donators of the Monasteries in the Hetmanshchyna epoch: A Social Portrait"]. *Ukrainian Historical Journal* 2 (2022): 30–45.

- Rusakova, Yuliia. *Neavtentychni dokumenty Kyievo-Pecherskoho monastyria XVI–XVII st.: tekstolohiia i pozemelnyi aspekt pobutuvannia* [Unauthentic documents of Kyiv-Pechersk Monastery in the 16th–17th centuries: textual criticism and land aspect of functioning]. Dys. ... kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.06. Kyiv: M. S. Hrushevsky Institute of Ukrainian Archeography and Source Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2008.
- Rychka, Volodymyr. “Kyiv – druhyi Yerusalym” (z istorii politychnoi dumky ta ideolohii serednovichnoi Rusi) [“Kyiv is the second Jerusalem” (from the history of political thought and ideology of Medieval Rus)]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2005.
- Sas, Petro. “Vidnovlennia pravoslavnoi tserkovnoi iierarkhii Kyivskoi mytropolii (1620)” [“Restoration of the Orthodox Church Hierarchy of the Kyiv Metropolitanate (1620)”]. *Ukrainian Historical Journal* 4 (2010): 15–39.
- Shaposhnik, Viacheslav. “Prigovory o tserkovno-monastyrskom zemlevladdenii v period pravleniia Ivana Groznogo” [“Verdicts on church and monastic land ownership during the reign of Ivan the Terrible”]. *Khristianskoe chtenie* 3 (2012): 6–31.
- Smolii, Valerii, & Valerii Stepankov. “Derzhavna ekonomichna polityka ta stanovlennia natsionalnoi hospodarsko-ekonomichnoi modeli” [“State economic policy and formation of the national economic model”]. In *Ukrainskyi Hetmanat: narysy istorii natsionalnoho derzhavotvorennia XVII–XVIII st.* Vol. 2, 147–186. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 2018.
- — —. “Ekonomika kozatskoi Ukrainy (1648–1676)” [“Economy of Cossack Ukraine (1648–1676)”]. In *Ekonomichna istoriia Ukrainy: Istoryko-ekonomichne doslidzhennia.* Vol. 1, 411–446. Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr, 2011.
- Sokyrko, Oleksii. “Skilky koshtuie porozuminnia? ‘Poklony’ ta ‘nakladky’ v ukrainskykh sudakh pershoi chverti XVIII stolittia” [“How Much for the Agreement? ‘Poklons’ and ‘Naklads’ in the Ukrainian Courts of the early 18th century”]. *SOTSIUM. Almanakh sotsialnoi istorii* 7 (2007): 195–209.
- Stollberg-Rilinger, Barbara. “Symbolische Kommunikation in der Vormoderne. Begriffe – Thesen – Forschungsperspektiven.” *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 31, no 4 (2004): 489–527.
- — —. *Rituale.* Frankfurt am Main: Beltz Druckpartner, Hemsbach, 2013.
- Ukraina – kozatska derzhava. Iliustrovana istoriia ukrainskoho kozatstva u 5175 fotosvitlynakh* [Ukraine is a Cossack state. Illustrated history of the Ukrainian Cossacks in 5175 photographs], eds. V. Nediak, V. Shcherbak, O. Fedoruk. Kyiv: Emma, 2007.
- Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho 1648–1657* [Universals of Bohdan Khmelnytskyi 1648–1657], edited: I. Krypiakevych, I. Butych. Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Alternatyvy”, 1998.
- “Universaly getmana Danila Apostola” [“Universals of Hetman Danylo Apostol”]. In *Materialy dlia otechestvennoi istorii*, edited by M.O. Sudienko. Vol. I. Kiev: Univer. tip., 1853.
- Universaly Ivana Mazepy. 1687–1709* [Universals of Ivan Mazepa. 1687–1709], edited I. Butych. Vol. 1. Kyiv; Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka u Lvovi, 2002.
- Universaly Ivana Mazepy. 1687–1709* [Universals of Ivan Mazepa. 1687–1709], edited: I. Butych, V. Rynsevych. Vol. 2. Kyiv; Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka u Lvovi, 2006.
- Universaly Pavla Polubotka (1722–1723)* [Universals of Pavlo Polubotok], edited V. Rynsevych. Kyiv:VIPOL, 2008.
- Universaly ukrainskykh hetmaniv vid Ivana Vyhovskoho do Ivana Samoilovycha (1657–1687)* [Universals of Ukrainian hetmans from Ivan Vyhovsky to Ivan Samoilovych (1657–1687)], edited: I. Butych, V. Rynsevych, I. Teslenko. Kyiv; Lviv: Naukove tovarystvo im. Shevchenka u Lvovi, 2004.

Veselovskii, Stepan. "Monastyrskoe zemlevladienie v Moskovskoi Rusi vo vtoroi polovine XVI veka" ["Monastic land tenure in Muscovite Rus in the second half of the 16th century"]. *Istoricheskie zapiski* 10 (1941): 101–14.

Yakovenko, Natalia. "Hospodari vitchyzny': uivlennia kozatskoi ta tserkovnoi elity Hetmanatu pro pryrodu, reprezentatsiiu i oboviazky vlady (do pochatku XVIII stolittia)" ["Masters of the Fatherland': the idea of the Cossack and church elite of the Hetmanate about the nature, representation, and duties of power (until the beginning of the 18th century)"]. In Natalia Yakovenko, *Mirrors of Identity. Studies in the History of Concepts and Ideas in Ukraine (16th through the Early 18th Century)*, 397–426. Kyiv: Laurus, 2012.



Oksana Prokopyuk is a Candidate of Sciences in History, leading research fellow, Department of History and Archeology, National Preserve "Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra." She is also a visiting researcher at the Goethe University Frankfurt am Main, research group "Polycentricity and Plurality of Premodern Christianities" (POLY). Her research interests include history of the church, religious and cultural history, social history, history of empires of Eastern Europe, and eighteenth-century studies. She has authored about 80 scholarly publications (books, articles, and reviews) in the fields of the history of the Kyiv Orthodox Metropolitanate in the early modern period. Her major publication is *Dukhovna konsystoriia v systemi yeparkhialnoho upravlinnia (1721–1786 rr.)*. (Ecclesiastic Consistory in the System of Diocesan Government (1721–1786)). (Kyiv: Natsionalnyi Kyievo-Pecherskyi istoryko-kulturnyi zapovidnyk; Feniks, 2008).