

UDC 351.82 : 330.562.39

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32849/2663-5313/2023.2.08>**Dmytro Kuzmenko,***Candidate of Juridical Science, Senior Researcher, Scientific Institute of Public Law, 2a, H. Kirpa street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 03055, Letund@gmail.com***ORCID:** 0000-0002-7437-0122

Kuzmenko, Dmytro (2023). Particularities of functioning of civil-military administrations on the territory of Ukraine during the existence of the Hetman state. *Entrepreneurship, Economy and Law*, 2, 49–53, doi <https://doi.org/10.32849/2663-5313/2023.2.08>

PARTICULARITIES OF FUNCTIONING OF CIVIL-MILITARY ADMINISTRATIONS ON THE TERRITORY OF UKRAINE DURING THE EXISTENCE OF THE HETMAN STATE

Abstract. Purpose. The purpose of the article is to clarify the particularities of functioning of civil-military administrations on the territory of Ukraine during the existence of the Hetman state. **Results.** The relevance of the article is due to the fact that civil-military administrations have operated on the territory of Ukraine at various times. The study of such historical experience is necessary in the current Ukrainian reality, as it will help identify the strengths and weaknesses of models of governing territories through civil-military administrations. Moreover, information systemised and analysed can serve as an essential basis for building a strategy for mechanisms and models of civil-military governance of territories in our time. As a result of the successful national liberation struggle led by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, the Ukrainian Cossack state was formed, and a new administrative division called regimental system was introduced to a large part of the territory of modern Ukraine. If we draw parallels, a regiment was a kind of region, and a *sotnia* (company) was a district. The basic military-administrative unit was the *kurin* (performing organisational and economic functions). **Conclusions.** It is emphasised that regiments and companies represented the civil-military administrations of the Ukrainian Cossack state. The administrative division of the newly created state generally repeated the structure of the Cossack army. Administrative-territorial units, i.e. regiments and companies, corresponded to the military hierarchy of the Cossacks. Due to this overlap, the Cossacks were able to carry out mobilisation activities in the shortest possible time. The *History of the Ukrainian Cossacks* notes that the regimental-company system was not unique. It is found that the Hetmanate practiced removing a company in some regiments from jurisdiction of the colonel. It was then transferred directly to the Hetman or the General Military Chancellery. The author concludes that various forms of civil-military administrations have emerged on the territory of Ukraine over the centuries. Such administrations were introduced by both the Ukrainian state authorities and foreign states. The administrations of the Cossack Hetmanate were structured in such a way as to mobilise significant military resources in the entrusted territories efficiently and quickly. Regiments and companies corresponded to the structure of the army. At a time when there was a military threat from all sides, such a system was very effective and timely.

Key words: government, land fund, taxation, judicial functions, mobilisation.

1. Introduction

Civil-military administrations have also operated on the territory of Ukraine at various times. The study of such historical experience is necessary in the current Ukrainian reality, as it will help identify the strengths and weaknesses of models of governing territories through civil-military administrations. Moreover, information systemised and analysed can serve as an essential basis for building a strategy for mechanisms and models of civil-military governance of territories in our time.

The Zaporozhian Sich, although not a state in the classical sense of the word, had a number of important features. In general, the Zaporozhian host had two systems of division: military and territorial. In military terms, the Cossack community was divided into *kurins*, with a total number of 38. It was the system of *kurins* that formed the basis of the administrative division of the *Sich*. According to the territorial principle, the Sich was first divided into 5, and later into 8 *palankas*. According to D. Yavornytskyi's *The History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks*,

the genesis of this particular structure is still unknown (Yavornytskyi, 1990, p. 157).

2. Particularities of the administrative-territorial division of the territory of Ukraine during the existence of the Hetmanate

In general, the term "*kurin*" was used in two ways: as a dwelling and as an independent unit of the host. Therefore, a Cossack's affiliation with a particular *kurin* meant either that he lived there or that he was enrolled in the *kurin* but lived elsewhere. Mostly, Cossacks were only registered with a particular *kurin*, while in the *kurin* only about one tenth of the Cossacks remained, relative to the entire host. The rest were engaged in their own economic affairs, etc. The term "*palanka*" was used by the Cossacks as a central administrative structure on the territory, the administration or department itself, and the territory where the Zaporozhian liberties operated (Yavornytskyi, 1990, pp. 159–160). It should be noted that every Cossack in the *Sich* had a double chain of command. Accordingly, in administrative and judicial terms, they were subordinated to the *palanka* administration, and in economic and military terms to the *kurin*. According to the collective monograph *Essays on the History of the Civil Service in Ukraine*, as well as Cossack law in general, the Cossack administrative system embodied a specific symbiosis: "...Ukrainian customary law, elements of German Magdeburg law and provisions of Lithuanian statutes" (Arkusha, Borodin, Vidnianskyi, 2009, p. 80).

In *kurins*, the *starshyna* (officers) of the *kurin* was the managerial element. Each *kurin*, as a military-administrative unit, had its own military traditions, etc. The *kurins* had their own customary law, which was eventually unified. On average, 200 to 400 Cossacks were assigned to each *kurin*. Registration was carried out in *kurin komputs* (the so-called Cossack registers). At the general meeting of the *kurin*, a senior officer, also called *kurinnyi*, or *otaman*, was elected. This was the first person for the Cossacks after the *Kish otaman* (the main person in the *Sich*). In addition to military and administrative powers, *kurin otamans* performed judicial functions (they had the right to impose corporal punishment). The *kurin otaman* could even sentence to death. *Kurin otamans* were re-elected mostly once a year at *kurin* meetings (all Cossacks who were registered with the relevant *kurin* according to the *komput* could participate). Although the *otaman* had considerable powers, he did not have any pronounced privileges; he lived with everyone else in the *kurin* but had only a symbolic advantage – he was given a special place at the table (Arkusha, Borodin, Vidnianskyi, 2009, p. 80).

In *palankas* located outside the *Sich*, as administrative units of the Cossacks, admin-

istrative powers were exercised by the head of the *palanka* - the *palanka* colonel and the local *starshyna* (*osavul* (aide-de-camp, the colonel's closest aide), a *pysar* (scribe), sub-*osavul* and sub-*pysar*). The *starshyna* of the *palanka* were elected. They were elected at the *Sich*, and their term of office ranged from one to three years. *Palankas* were directly subordinate to the *Kish*. Traditionally, the *palanka* leadership was elected only from among the *Sich* members. At the *palankas*, there was a special council of "staid good Cossacks" (those Cossacks who did not live in the *Sich* and had families). The *palanka* also had a *palanka* court, represented by the *kurin otaman* of the *kurin* in charge of the respective *palanka*. All the inhabitants of the *palanka* and those who lived there temporarily were subordinate to the *palanka* colonel. The *palanka* colonel embodied administrative, judicial and military power on the territory of the *palanka*. After their election, colonels and *starshyna* (officers) received written confirmation from the *Sich* to exercise their powers; the document outlined their rights and duties, the amount of salary for officials (Arkusha, Borodin, Vidnianskyi, 2009, pp. 81–82).

Over time, in the eighteenth century, the administrative structure of the Zaporozhian Cossacks underwent major changes. In the 1740s, the *palanka* system was extended to all the lands under the jurisdiction of the *Kish*. At that time, not only central settlements but also smaller administrative units were called *palankas*. The *palanka* colonel was no longer elected but appointed (by *Kish*). *Palankas* had their own seals. The size of the *palankas* can be estimated by analysing several of them. For example, the Buhohardivska *palanka*, which was located between the left bank of the Pivdennyi Buh River and the right bank of the Inhulets River, the Dnipro River and the border with the Crimean Khanate, had approximately 500 wintering places (a Cossack farm, a hamlet). The Samara *palanka*, located on the left bank of the *Sich's* possessions between the Kinska and Samara rivers, was the largest. The *palanka* centre was located in the town of Samara, and in general, there were several thousand Zaporozhian farms, i.e. wintering places, and a significant number of large villages on the territory of the *palanka* (Smolii, 2006, pp. 608–610).

As a result of the successful national liberation struggle led by Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, the Ukrainian Cossack state was formed, and a new administrative division called regimental system was introduced to a large part of the territory of modern Ukraine. If we draw parallels, a regiment was a kind of region, and a *sotnia* (company) was a district. The

basic military-administrative unit was the *kurin* (performing organisational and economic functions).

The average *kurin* consisted of 10 Cossacks at first. The leader was the *otaman*, who was either appointed by the *sotnyk* or elected by the *kurin* community. In the eighteenth century, *kurins* already included 20–30 people, and sometimes even 70. Each company consisted of approximately 10 to 20 *kurins*, which united several villages. *Kurin otamans* were subordinated to the *sotnia* leadership and, as mentioned above, performed mostly organisational and economic functions (Zaruba, 2007, p. 31).

However, it is necessary to focus on regiments and companies that represented the civil-military administrations of the Ukrainian Cossack state. The administrative division of the newly created state generally repeated the structure of the Cossack army. Administrative-territorial units, i.e. regiments and companies, corresponded to the military hierarchy of the Cossacks. Due to this overlap, the Cossacks were able to carry out mobilisation activities in the shortest possible time. The *History of the Ukrainian Cossacks* notes that the regimental-company system was not unique. The mobilisation principle of administrative division was used in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (county and voivodeship system) and in the Kingdom of Poland. The unique feature of the system introduced in the new Ukrainian state was that regiments and companies were much smaller in size than voivodeships and counties. The experience of the registered Cossack regiments was used in the introduction of the new system (Smolii, 2006, pp. 314–315).

Regiments, in turn, were divided into companies. The number of companies in different regiments could vary significantly, from 8 in Chernihiv to 23 in Bila Tserkva (as of 1649). The population of the companies and regiments was also uneven. For example, according to the *kompuz* (register) of the Chernihiv regiment, there were 997 Cossacks, while the Korsun regiment had 3472 Cossacks. The Romny *Sotnia* of the Myrhorod Regiment consisted of 300 Cossacks, and, for example, the Sytnytsia *Sotnia* of the Korsun Regiment consisted of 48 Cossacks, and the Regimental *Sotnia* of the Kyiv Regiment consisted of 8 Cossacks. Cities and small towns or even large villages could become the administrative centres of the companies. Moreover, regimental administrations were located in cities. The name of the *sotnia* was traditionally given according to the name of the settlement where the *sotnia* administration was located; it was extremely rare for a company to be named after the surname of the *sotnyk* (Smolii, 2006, p. 318).

3. Particularities of the division of regimental and company administrations on the territory of Ukraine during the existence of the Hetmanate

In the administrative centres, the respective regimental and company administrations functioned. They were called governments. The regimental government was composed of a colonel and a regimental *starshyna*. The colonel had a regimental council, which elected him and the *starshyna*. Over time, Bohdan Khmelnytskyi began to appoint the regimental leadership in order to concentrate power. The colonel personified all the power on the ground. They had a wide range of powers in administrative matters, exercised judicial and financial powers, and were in charge of military matters (e.g., mobilisation activities, disposal of land). The colonel largely duplicated the powers of the hetman, but only within the regiment under his jurisdiction (Sas, Smolii, Stepenkov, 2014, p. 60). The colonel was in charge of mobilising Cossacks within the regiments, and as for the management of the Cossack land fund (rank estates), it should be noted that it was the colonel who granted land that had previously belonged to the Polish gentry to ordinary Cossacks and *starshyna* as payment for their service in the host. The colonel collected taxes for the host treasury and also managed enterprises (he could, for example, lease them out) that belonged to the host fund (Smolii, 2006, p. 319).

The regimental commander relied on the regimental *starshyna* (officers) for his authority. The *starshyna* consisted of a regimental *oboznyi* (quartermaster, artillery commander), an *osavul* (aide-de-camp, the colonel's closest aide), a *pysar* (scribe), and a regimental judge. They, together with the regimental council of *starshyna* and the regimental office, exercised the powers of the *Starshyna* General, the *Starshyna's* Council and the General Chancellery, but, of course, within the regiment [3, p. 60]. The model for the organisation of the civil-military administration of the companies was generally the regimental one. Each company was headed by a *sotnyk*. The symbol of his authority was the banner. His assistants in the performance of administrative functions were *horodovyi* (town), *sotnia* and *kurin otamans*. The company administration included a *sotnia's* *pysar* (secretary), *osavul*, *khорунжий* (flag-bearer, protector of the regimental banner). The *starshyna* of the *sotnia* were subordinate to the regimental administration and the hetman. Companies performed a wide range of administrative powers and functions, as well as military (Zaruba, 2007, p. 30).

Until 1649, the government of the *sotnia* was elected by and subordinate to the Cossack

council. However, over time, this first became a formality as the central government, represented by the hetman, gained more power, and then the colonel began to appoint the *sotnyks*. The *sotnyk* was subordinate to the colonel in the hierarchy of power and had significant judicial, administrative and military powers. The *sotnia* scribe and the *osavul* had the same functions as the regimental scribe and the *osavul*. At the same time, a special place in the vertical of governance was occupied by the town *otaman*, who was vested with administrative power in Ukrainian towns. He was in charge of law enforcement and also acted as commandant there, and if the *sotnyk* was absent, he headed the board of the company court. The town *otamans* of the cities where the regimental administration was located were even higher in status than the *sotnyks*, as they were part of the regimental government (Sas, Smolii, Stepenkov, 2014, p. 60).

It should be noted that the Hetmanate practiced removing a company in some regiments from jurisdiction of the colonel. It was then transferred directly to the Hetman or the General Military Chancellery. Such company was in the capital Baturyn, Hlukhiv (Zaruba, 2007, p. 31).

Regimental and company governments were thus the embodiment of civil-military administrations on the territory of Ukraine. In addition to civilian affairs, such as managing the land fund, organising tax payments, and performing judicial functions, colonels and *sotnyks* in the regiments and companies entrusted to them dealt with mobilisation issues and monitored the combat capability of Cossack armed formations. The organisation of administrations using the Cossack military hierarchy facilitated the rapid mobilisation of Cossacks, which

significantly increased the combat capability of the Cossack state.

4. Conclusions

Therefore, various forms of civil-military administrations have emerged on the territory of Ukraine over the centuries. Such administrations were introduced by both the Ukrainian state authorities and foreign states. The administrations of the Cossack Hetmanate were structured in such a way as to mobilise significant military resources in the entrusted territories efficiently and quickly. Regiments and companies corresponded to the structure of the army. At a time when there was a military threat from all sides, such a system was very effective and timely.

References:

Arkusha, O.H., Borodin, Ye.I., Vidnianskyi, S.V. (2009). *Narysy istorii derzhavnoi sluzhby v Ukraini* [Essays on the history of civil service in Ukraine]. Kyiv: Nika-Tsentr [in Ukrainian].

Yavorsnytskyi, D.I. (1990). *Istoriia zaporizkykh kozakiv* [History of the Zaporozhian Cossacks]. Lviv: Svit [in Ukrainian].

Sas, P., Smolii, V., Stepenkov, V. (2014). *Ukrainska derzhava druhoi polovyny XVII–XVIII st.: polityka, suspilstvo, kultura* [The Ukrainian state of the second half of the 17th–18th centuries: politics, society, culture]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].

Smolii, V.A. (2006). *Istoriia ukrainskoho kozatstva* [History of the Ukrainian Cossacks]. K.: Vyd. dim "Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia" [in Ukrainian].

Zaruba, V.M. (2007). *Administratyvno-terytorialnyi ustroi ta administratsiia Viiska Zaporozkoho u 1648–1782 rr.* [Administrative-territorial structure and administration of the Zaporozhian Army in 1648–1782]. Dnipropetrovsk: Lira LTD [in Ukrainian].

Дмитро Кузьменко,

кандидат юридичних наук, старший науковий співробітник, вулиця Г. Кірпи, 2а, Київ, Україна, індекс 03035, Letund@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-7437-0122

ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ФУНКЦІОНУВАННЯ ВІЙСЬКОВО-ЦИВІЛЬНИХ АДМІНІСТРАЦІЙ НА ТЕРИТОРІЇ УКРАЇНИ В ПЕРІОД ІСНУВАННЯ ГЕТЬМАНСЬКОЇ ДЕРЖАВИ

Анотація. Мета. Метою статті є з'ясування особливостей функціонування військово-цивільних адміністрацій на території України в період існування Гетьманської держави **Результати.** Актуальність статті полягає в тому, що на території України в різні часи також діяли адміністрації військово-цивільного характеру. Дослідження подібного історичного досвіду потрібне в сучасних українських реаліях, оскільки це дасть змогу виявити сильні та слабкі сторони моделей управління територіями через військово-цивільні адміністрації. Зі свого боку, систематизована та проаналізована інформація може слугувати суттєвим базисом для вибудовування стратегії щодо механізмів і моделей військово-цивільного управління територіями в наш час. Унаслідок успішної національно-визвольної боротьби під проводом Б. Хмельницького утворилась українська козацька держава,

отже, на значну частину території сучасної України було поширено новий адміністративний поділ, який отримав назву полково-сотенний. Якщо проводити паралелі, то полк поставав своєрідною областю, а сотня – районом. Базовою військово-адміністративною ланкою був курінь (виконували організаційно-господарські функції). **Висновки.** Наголошено, що полки та сотні уособлювали військово-цивільні адміністрації української козацької держави. Адміністративний поділ новоствореної держави загалом повторював структуру козацького війська. Адміністративно-територіальні одиниці, тобто полки та сотні, відповідали військовій ієрархії козаків. Завдяки такому дублюванню козаки мали змогу в найкоротші терміни здійснювати мобілізаційні заходи. В «історії українського козацтва» зазначається, що полково-сотенний устрій не був унікальним. З'ясовано, що використовувалася в Гетьманській державі практика, коли в окремих полках сотня могла вилучатися з-під юрисдикції полковника. Вона тоді передавалася в підпорядкування безпосередньо гетьману або генеральній військовій канцелярії. Зроблено висновок, що на території України протягом багатьох століть виникали різні форми військово-цивільних адміністрацій. Такі адміністрації впроваджувались як українською державною владою, так і іноземними державами. Адміністрації за часів козацької гетьманської держави були побудовані таким чином, щоб ефективно та швидко мобілізувати значні військові ресурси у ввірених територіях. Полки та сотні відповідали устрою війська. У часи, коли з усіх сторін існувала військова загроза, така система була дуже ефективною та на часі.

Ключові слова: уряд, земельний фонд, сплата податків, судові функції, мобілізація.

The article was submitted 17.10.2023

The article was revised 08.11.2023

The article was accepted 28.11.2023