




Slavic-Turkic Relations in the Steppe Frontier in Local Historiography in the 19th and Early 20th Centuries

Liudmyla Novikova¹ 



¹Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar:
Liudmyla Novikova (Assoc. Prof.), II
Mechnikov Odessa National University,
Faculty of History and Philosophy,
Department of History, Ukraine.
E-posta: novikova@onu.edu.ua
ORCID: 0000-0003-4764-7867

Submitted/Başvuru: 15.09.2020

Revision Requested/Revizyon Talebi:
15.11.2020

Last Revision Received/Son Revizyon:
18.11.2020

Accepted/Kabul: 18.02.2021

Citation/Atf: Novikova, Liudmyla, "Slavic-Turkic Relations in the Steppe Frontier in Local Historiography in the 19th and Early 20th Centuries", *Güneydoğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 35 (2020), s. 73-88.
<https://doi.org/10.26650/gaad.795329>

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the process of the forming of a special historiography approach as Frontier one in historical science in the Russian empire in the 19–early 20th centuries and partly in the post-imperial period in the circumstances of rising national states. This was chosen for the analytical authors who represented the Frontier studies, exploring mostly Slobids'ka (Sloboda) Ukraine and Southern Ukraine, which the geographical situation influenced their history and allowed them to determine the Frontier historiography approach.

Keywords: Slobids'ka (Sloboda) Ukraine, Southern Ukraine, Dmytro Ivanovych Bahaliy, Apollon Olexandrovych Skal'kovs'kyi, Frontier Historiography Approach In 19–Early 20th Centuries



The problem of social relations in the area of the Slavic-Turkic frontier in Eastern Europe had existed historically for several centuries. A special role in its revealing and theoretical understanding was played by local Russian (imperial) and Ukrainian historiography in the 19th – the early 20th century. That was determined by the fact that the factor of these relations, although it also had a huge impact on the history of the state and people as more general categories, most affected the history of the certain (frontier, edge) regions of the state and/or ethnic territory (particularly for the Ukrainian people), formed their borders, defined the specifics of socio-economic development, social structure and so on. Developed in that period, theoretical approaches for their time were marked with methodological novelty and determined to solve major historical issues. The historical facts introduced into scientific and public circulation covered a specific picture of society life, peculiar to Slavic-Turkic frontier.

Selected for the research problem concerns the coverage in the local Russian empire and post-empire historiography of the 19th – early 20th century the issue of the historic frontier interaction. Researchers have not sufficiently investigated this theme, although there was a certain complex of works dedicated to historians who in one way or another covered different aspects of frontier interaction or confrontation with Turkic peoples. However, often the frontier theme is “hiding” in the works of historians of the 19th and early 20th centuries behind other concepts: different interpretations of “regional” or local history (for example so called “oblast” one), the history of colonization (settlement) of certain territories, national history, and finally the frontier problematics existed in historiography but marginalised.

The purpose of this study is to consider the topic of frontier Slavic-Turkic interactions and its consequences in the writings of historians, who represents the local history in the 19th and early 20th centuries, to clarify the peculiarities of the coverage of the problem with researchers of the history of mostly Slobids’ka Ukraine and Southern Ukraine (on examples by works of famous historians Apollon O(A)lexandrovych Skal’kovs’kyi and Dmytro Ivanovych Bahaliy).

Historiographic and historical aspects of the problem of Slavic-Turkic relations were already partly covered in our works. Some aspects of problems are revealed in writings devoted to the works by A. O. Skal’kovs’kyi, as well as D. I. Bahaliy. The latter is considered by researchers as a historian of Ukraine, and as a regional researcher as well, in particular,

of Slobids'ka Ukraine (in the works of V. V. Kravchenko, O. M. Bogdashyna, P. D. Pyrig, etc.)¹. Although the researchers mainly emphasize on A. O. Skal'kovs'kyi and D. I. Bahaliy's contribution to the history of studying of the colonization (as settlement of a certain territory) (especially by Ukrainian people), at the same time they touch the issue that colonization, described by the historians, was carried out as a kind of "Reconquista" the territory from Tatars (the term used by V. V. Kravchenko). O. M. Bogdashyna drew attention to the fact that D. I. Bahaliy regarded his name of Turkic origin, which means "lucid" or "expensive"². This fact was in favour of the fact that the problem of the frontier, obviously, was for this historian not only historical but personal to some extent.

1. Searching the Theoretical Approaches: the "Border" and Connection between Regional ("Oblast") and Frontier Histories

The problem of Slavic-Turkic frontier was formed in historiography in the 19th century gradually. Significant role in this process played the analysis of specific historical circumstances and historical methodology (romanticism, positivism), which, regardless of character, often acknowledged a large role of geographical factors in history. In the Russian historiography quite bright the frontier view in connection with the geographical factor expressed in the works of Sergii Mykhailovych Solovyov, who opposed the "forest" Moscow State towards steppe, and most importantly, that he specified in the 1860-ies the fact that Rus' (Kyivan) was founded in "field [to be exact, "pol's'ka", which sounded like "Polish" in Russian] (steppe) ukraina (in historian view it was term for borderland or territory edge)", or in "Dnieper Steppe

1 Vladimir Vasilievich Kravchenko, *Dmitrii Ivanovich Bagalei: nauchnaia i obshchestvenno-politicheskaia deiatel'nost'*, Kharkov: Osnova 1990. 176 p.; Volodymyr Vasyliovych Kravchenko, "Slavnykh pradivid velykykh...", *D. I. Bagaliy, Istoriia Slobids'koi Ukrainy*, Kharkiv: Osnova 1991, pp. 6-12 (Kravchenko, Slavnykh pradivid); Volodymyr Vasyliovych Kravchenko, "D. I. Bahaliy: shliakh zolotoi seredyny (do 140-richchia z dnia narodzhennia", *Drjevnosti. Harkovskij istoriko-arheologičeskij ežegodnik*, Kharkov 1999, [vol.] 1997-1998, pp. 16-40 (Kravchenko, D. I. Bahaliy: shliakh); Olena Mykolaivna Bogdashyna, "Slobids'kyi litopysec' istorii Ukrainy D. I. Bagaliy", *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2008, № 1, pp. 88-112 (Bogdashyna, Slobids'kyi litopysec'); Olena Mykolaivna Bogdashyna, "D. I. Bagaliy u suchasni ukrains'kii istoriografii", *Visnyk Kharkiv'skogo natsional'nogo universitetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Serija: Istoriia Ukrainy. Ukrainoznavstvo: isnorychni ta filosof's'ki nauky*, 2017, vol. 25, pp. 98-107 (Bogdashyna, D. I. Bagaliy u suchasni); Petro Pyrig, "D. I. Bahaliy iak doslidnyk istorii Slobozhanshchyny", *Akademiia pamiaty professora Volodymyra Antonovycha*, Kyiv 1994, pp. 193-201; Liudmyla Novikova, «*Istoriograph*» Apollon Skal'kovs'kyi: intelektual'na apologia impers'koi polityky ta regional'noi istorychnoi samobutnosti, Odesa: Odes'kyi natsional'nyi universytet 2012, 463 p. (Novikova, «Istoriograph» Apollon Skal'kovs'kyi); Liudmyla Novikova, "Kryms'kyi chynnyk v istorii kozatstva u zobrazhenni istoriykiv pershoi polovyny XIX st.", *Chornomors'ka mynuvshyna*, Odesa 2010, vol. 5, pp. 52-60 (Novikova, Kryms'kyi chynnyk); Liudmyla Novikova, "Khadzhybeis'ka tematyka v pratsiakh odes'kogo doslidnyka A. O. Skal'kovs'kogo (1808-1898)", «*Kochubeiv-Khadzhybei-Odesa: materialy Pershoi Vseukrains'koi naukovoï konferencii, prysviachenoï 600-chchu mista, m. Odesa, 28-29 travnia 2015 r.*, Odesa 2015, pp. 99-102 (Novikova, Khadzhybeis'ka tematyka); Liudmyla Novikova, "Pravo volodyty terytoriiu «Bessarabii» u XX " na pochatku XX st.: skladne perepletinnia argumentiv zatsikavlenykh storin v umovakh regionu-frontyru", *Chornomors'ka mynuvshyna*, Odesa 2017, vol. 12, pp. 78-100 (Novikova, Pravo volodyty terytoriiu).

2 Kravchenko, Slavnykh pradivid, p. 6; Bogdashyna, Slobids'kyi litopysec', p. 90.

Ukraina”³. The other historians also appealed to the category of “ukraina” (as a territory edge) or “Steppe”, which was both a geographical concept and political, and D. I. Bahaliy on the first view directly repeats the opinion of S. M. Solovyov, although he comes to it, obviously, by himself, through the analysis of sources. The very same S. M. Solovyov could draw attention to the problem of the “Steppe” due to the work of such historians as A. O. Skal’kovs’kyi – if to match the chronology of works by all mentioned historians (A. O. Skal’kovs’kyi started to study the history of Steppe in 1830-ies)⁴.

The term “frontier”, which we use for the characteristics for views of part of researchers on the history of Slobids’ka and Southern Ukraine in the 19th – early 20th centuries, is, at the first view, a certain modernization. On the other hand, we have mentioned the attempts of the historians of that time to make some methodology, and a big role in this process that D. I. Bahaliy has played. He theoretically tried to outline the historical problems of the border history (as the border, first of all, of Rus’ and Russian state and also peoples (including Ukrainians) with the Tatar (or Turkic) steppe, and to give it a specific interpretation in the late 19th century and later during the Ukrainian national-democratic revolution of 1917-1921.

D. I. Bahaliy is regarded traditionally as a representative of the regional (“oblast”) school in historiography (the Kyiv historical school of professor Volodymyr Bonifatiyovych Antonovych (the teacher of D. I. Bahaliy) and Kharkiv documentary school as her branch)⁵. We assume that the concept of “regional” (“oblast”) historiography in V. B. Antonovych’s interpretation associated primarily with the period of Rus’ (Kyivan Rus’) and exploring the history of regions of Rus’ could be only a preparatory stage for the transition to the history of the frontiers, the same for D. I. Bahaliy’s studies. For example, in the regional (“oblast”) school of V. B. Antonovych researchers paid attention to the areas of the Rus’, their colonization (settlement) and confrontation with Polovtsians (Cumans), that is, the works of “oblast” approach also had a certain element of the “frontier approach”, but within one historical period, and the confrontations with the Pechenigs and Polovtsians were considered as one of the factors of the formation of a concrete part of the boundaries of borders of the lands-principalities of Rus’.

Research similar to the works of honour by D. I. Bahaliy A. O. Skal’kovs’kyi, of D. I. Bahaliy himself, written on the history of Slobids’ka and the Southern Ukraine, can be attributed as to the regional direction (in one or another sense)⁶, as to the frontier approach, especially in the case of D. I. Bahaliy, who investigated the moveable during the centuries borders of the Russian state and Slobods’ka Ukraine with a so called Wild Field (“Dyke Pole”) – territory of the Tatar residence. It has been proving, firstly, chronologically: they mostly cover other historical

3 Liudmyla Novikova, “Pytannia pokhodzennia, sutnosti ta istorii kozatstva v pratsiakh rosiis’kogo istoryka S. M. Solovyova”, *Chornomors’ka mynuvshyna*, Odesa 2011, vol. 6. p. 83.

4 A. A. Skal’kovskii, *Khronologicheskoe obozrieniie istori Novorossiiskogo kraia*, Odesa: V Gor. tip. 1836, t. 1. p. 3 (A. A. Skal’kovskii, *Khronologicheskoe obozrieniie*).

5 Kravchenko, D. I. Bahaliy: shliakh, pp. 16-40.

6 Kravchenko, *ibid.*, p. 20.

periods than the times of Rus', and secondly, they define the specifics of the border areas by identifying the role of the Turkic-Slavic relations in the historical conditions "after Rus'". The frontier features of works, especially of D. I. Bahaliy, is most vivid reflected in using of special terms (as we have mentioned for S. M. Solovyov before) – "pol'ska (i.e. "field" (as field, that is on the border with the "Wild Field") ukraina" (here – "borderland, edge").

Taking into consideration the proposed relationship between regional (as "oblast") and frontier research, the sources of D. I. Bahaliy's frontier approach can be more understandable due to his student work, written under the leadership of V. B. Antonovych. It is in this work called "History of the Severia [Severskaya] land until the mid-14th century" (1882)⁷ D. I. Bagaliy, for the first time examines the problem of the influence of relations between the Slavs and Polovtsians (Cumans) in the history of this region. The text of the work allows one to get acquainted with the origins of the historian's attitude to the problem of influence of Slavic-Turkic relations on the moving border between the Steppes and Rus'. These issues have been integrated into more common problems of Severia [Severskaya] land boundaries and their changes.

The appeal of this work allows one to better understand the later attitude of the historian to the spread of Moscow state, due to the Wild Field and to the creation of Slobids'ka Ukraine as a process of some kind of "Reconquista" (by exact expression of V. V. Kravchenko towards understanding this process by D. I. Bahaliy)⁸. Thus, in chapter 4 of D. I. Bagaliy's book named "Geography and colonization of the Severia [Severskaya] land from the mid-9th to the middle of the 13th century" the author, based on the "The Tale of Igor's Campaign", concluded that in the 12th century (when events reflected in the historical source took place), the boundary between the ancient Rus' lands and Polovtsians (Cumans)' places of nomadic life was Seversky Donets-Oskol watershed, and Donets as a frontier town of the Kursk' principality the historian placed on the Seversky Donets⁹. He further notes that «it is clear» that in the Don Basin the Slavic and predominantly Severyan population lived (which, according to D. I. Bahaliy, gave the name to Seversky Donets river). The historian further continued his thought: "This population served as a mediator between the purely Severyan population of the Desna river region and Sula river region and the remote Tmutarakan" [Black Sea-Azov region] and expanded there after successful wars Kyivan Rus' princes against Khazars. But in the 12th century the Polovtsians (Cumans) appeared and the situation had changed. Before there were Pechenigs who interfered with the ties with the Black Sea and Azov sea regions but they were politically weak. Against Polovtsians two century princes of Rus' made military campaigns, which had only temporary success. Consequently, the Rus' population was forced to retreat to the

7 D. Bagaley, *Istoriia Severskoi zemli do poloviny XIV st.*, Kiev: V universitetskoi tipografii (I. I. Zavadskogo) 1882, I, 310, 2, II p. (Bagaley, *Istoriia Severskoi*); Kravchenko, D. I. Bahaliy: shliakh, p. 18.

8 Kravchenko, Slavnykh pradidiv, p. 6.

9 Bagaley, *Istoriia Severskoi*, p. 130-131.

north. D. I. Bagaliy made the conclusion that due to these circumstances Rus' population on the Don and its tributaries had to disappear from there or mingle with Polovtsians and Rus' settlements on the coast of the seas were "wiped" by nomads. The place earlier owned by Slavs, now for them became "the unknown land", but it left, according to the historian, in the 12th century the appropriate historical memoirs¹⁰.

2. Arising A Frontier Theory: D. I. Bagaliy's Experience and Contribution

A little later in his "Essays from the history of colonization of the steppe outskirts of the Moscow state" (1887) D. I. Bagaliy has formulated its broad concept of the Frontier, which coexists with the concept of colonization of the so-called territory "outskirts" ("okrainas, ukrainas") of Moscow (Russian) state. Formulating his object of study, historian, quite similar, as stated above, with the views of S. M. Solovyov, noted that the term of "steppe or "po'lskaya" (i.e. "field") ukraina in [historical] acts is understood as the border of Moscow state adjacent to the Volga, Don and Dnieper steppes". He defined his subject of study as part of that Steppe outskirts, "which lies on the boundary of Donets and Dnieper basin, where now are Voronezh, Kursk and the Kharkiv prov."¹¹ At the same time, the historian in this work, and in others his works goes beyond the outlined subject of the research, which included Slobids'ka Ukraine, and appeals to the Right-bank Ukraine, and to the Southern Ukraine.

Frontier approach demanded that the historian explored the issue of ownership of the territory of Wild Field (or Steppe). He drew his attention to the fact that the Wild Field with its resources was the subject of attention for the Tatars, as well as having significant strategic importance for the Crimean Khanate. To clarify the boundaries of the Wild Field D. I. Bagaliy referred to historical sources of the second half of the 17th century, stressing that the true Tatar steppe began in what in his time was the territory of Ekaterinoslav province (where the most far posts of Moscow guards ("stanichniks") were situated in 16th and 17th centuries)¹².

The right of Moscow (Russian) state and people's (including Ukrainians) colonization to spread the boundaries to the south at the expense of territories that were the object of interest to the Tatars too, D. I. Bagaliy determined on the basis of the defending point of view of earlier Rus' possession of territory of the Wild Field. We met already this opinion in his student work of 1882. Later D. I. Bagaliy repeatedly tries to emphasize the existence of a certain population behind the borders of the Moscow State in the pre-Mongolian period, which allows him to interpret the spreading of the Moscow state's borders to the south as a "return" of the territories: it is worthy to note that Moscow State in Russian historiography

10 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 133-134.

11 Dmitrii Ivanovich Bagaley, *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii stepnoi okrainy Moskovskogo gosudarstva. Izdanie imp. Obshchestva istorii i drevnosti Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, Moskva: V Universitet. tip. (M. Katkov) 1887, p. I (Bagaley, *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii*).

12 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 285, 289.

often regarded as heiress of ancient Rus'. The same idea was developed by the historian when he paid his attention to establishing new settlements in places of the so-called "gorodisches", i. e. destroyed and abandoned settlements, that existed before.

An important factor in the proliferation or restriction of state and people colonization and spreading the frontiers to the south to the Wild Field (Steppe), D. I. Bagaliy considers the danger of Tatar attacks. He asks questions, whether the Tatar danger existed, whether the fight against it, which pulled on a lot of state and people resources, was justified and Tatar danger really was a significant factor in the life of the Frontier, of the history of the Moscow State, the Commonwealth, Ukrainian and Russian peoples. Therefore, he paid much attention to clarify this issue and justification for state policy and people colonization.

It should be noted that in historiography of that time there were two approaches to the coverage of this issue: one envisaged the publication of relevant documents on Tatar attacks and the consequences¹³, the other – inclusion in the text of historical works was the relevant information taken from the documents. We have the opportunity to get to know with the help of the historian's publications of documents on the results of the Tatar attacks the statistics contained in them as eloquent illustration of the losses that the frontier residents have endured: demographic, including gender, age, material¹⁴. Along with the publication of documents, D. I. Bagaliy made a detailed analysis of attacks of the Tatars and their consequences, including negative ones for the processes of colonization (settlement) of Russian and Ukrainian lands, their influence on the social structure of population, on the need of organization of the system of fortresses and other forms of defence and attack warnings and so on.

Tatars attack D. I. Bagaliy divided into two types: the mass attacks under the leadership of the Crimean khans (the most destructive) and attacks by small parties of Tatars, and indicated evolution in the direction of the growth of permanent small attacks on the territorial outskirts in the 17th century. However, Tatar attacks were not the only danger for the frontier, where (for example, for Belgorod, Voronezh and Tambov areas) was true: "... small guerrilla war in which all the benefits were on the side of those who attacked"¹⁵. The attacks were accompanied by robbery, fires, especially harmful in the sparsely populated area were captured, the sources even showed a new term – "to take out a village", the historian traces the fate of the captured. This demanded the creation of a system of social relations concerning those captured in Crimean Hanate and Ottoman empire. The problem appeared also in the lifestyle of border residents, it concerned cross-cultural marriages and its mutual (for Ukrainian and

13 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. IX.

14 [D. I. Bagaley], *Matierialy dlia istorii kolonizatsii i byta Kharkovskoi i otchasti Kurskoi i Voroniezhsioi gubernii*, Kharkov: Tipografiiia K. P. Schastni 1890, [t. II], p. 79, 81-84, 89, 91-101; D. I. Bagaley, *Matierialy dlia istorii kolonizatsii i byta stepnoi okrainy Moskovskogo gosudarstva (Kharkovskoi i otchasti Kurskoi i Voroniezhsioi gub.) v XVI – XVIII stolietii*, Kharkov: Tipografiiia K. P. Schastni, 1886, [t. I], p. 84-94, 157-163.

15 Bagaley, *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii*, p. 254, 258, 260, 462.

Tatar) consequences. The importance of the attacks of Tatars as the historical factor of life on the frontier was reflected in folklore¹⁶.

The historian stressed that the Tatar attacks, along with the attacks of other enemies of the frontier population, were much more intensive in the second half of the 17th – the first half of the 18th centuries in Slobids'ka, Ukraine than the Bilhorod and Voronezh areas of the Moscow State¹⁷. It is clear in view of its proximity to Tatar territories.

D. I. Bagaliy, analyzing Tatar attacks, indicates the conservatism of the technology and the purpose of attacks of the Tatars that were similar in the 15 – 18th centuries (the constant goal was the prisoners and cattle), and conservative “predatory” nature of the Crimean Khanate. There were also the stable household and military features of the “Steppe warriors” – the Crimean Tatars and Nogai Tatars¹⁸. The historian stated that there were little changes from the 17th century and in the sphere of interstate relations of Russia with the Crimean Khanate, except for the movement of the Frontier (border) towards the South, so it was then a New Serbia and “other provinces of New Russia region”. It was due to some changes in strategy of the Russia empire and moving from mostly defensive war (which also demanded the system of fortresses and population connecting with war skills) to an offensive one, especially under the rule of Catherine II, who destroyed “Krimian Hord”¹⁹.

Considering the importance of the negative influence of the Tatar factor for the frontier, D. I. Bahaliy at the same time saw the difference between the Tatars attackers and peaceful Tatars, as well as that, he made a difference between the Cossacks-Cherkasses (Ukrainian) and the so called “thieves”-Cossacks, who were hostile to the residents of the borderland: “Exactly the same for Russian man settled Tatar – merchant, craftsman or peasant – was not dangerous, but nomad and robbers making constant attacks on our ukrainas [edges, outskirts]”²⁰.

3. Slobids'ka Ukraine as the Frontier: Special Historian's View

Special attention D. I. Bagaliy has devoted to Slobids'ka Ukraine (the territory of contemporary D. I. Bahaliy Kharkiv province and parts of Voronezh and Kursk provinces), which was settled mainly by Ukrainians outside the defensive line of the Moscow State. The historian appeals to the first attempts in settling the territory of future Slobids'ka Ukraine. The staying of Zaporozhian Cossacks in the 16th century as guards on the Donets River and Oskol River, the author considers as a temporary case²¹. The more active settlement began

16 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 263-264, 346, 468-471.

17 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 466-467.

18 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 341-343, 346, 348.

19 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 238, 252, 277, 284, 348, 491.

20 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 289.

21 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 174.

in the 17th century. The historian came to the conclusion that on the territory of the future Slobids'ka Ukraine estate lands, "yurts" were "distributed" by Moscow state yet since 1617 (in the reign of Mikhail Fedorovich), that testified about its intentions to expand borders (yurts that were provided to owners instead of arable land, were accompanied by giving Tsar's charters).

D. I. Bagaliy drew his attention to the fact that the settlement of the territory of Slobids'ka Ukraine (behind the then border of the Moscow State) firstly was not included in the plans of the Moscow government, especially at the expense of the Cherkass Cossacks (Ukrainians), to whom allegedly the government firstly did not trust, but later in this case played a positive role in the argument that their homeland was (on the Right-Bank Ukraine) also defended against Tatars²². The historian showed that the revealed initiative of Ukrainian Cossacks to settle geographically closer to the Tatars was immediately combined with the initiative of the Russian state, which wanted to try to keep state control over the situation on the Frontier. The foundation of Chuguev was a striking example of that. Ukrainian Cossacks (Cherkasses) became practically the initiators of its foundation in 1638 on Chuguev abandoned settlement on the territory of a contemporary to historian Kharkiv province, at that time outside of the Moscow State. According to D. I. Bahaliy, this contradicted the policy of Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich, who planned to strengthen the existing towns along the border, not to establish new ones. This was also contrary to the previous practice of Ukrainian Cossacks, who by that time, in the case of transition to the service for the Moscow State, settled in already existing at that time in the border Moscow towns²³.

The temporary failure of the further existence of Chuguev historian bonded to random circumstances²⁴. State interest in the founding of Chuhuev far from the borders D. I. Bagaliy explained with two reasons: the arrival of a significant number of Ukrainian immigrants and the getting by the Moscow state the "best stronghold against Tatars". State needs in the borderland with Tatars in organized military force contributed to the preservation for the settlers and their traditional Cossack system, although there was simultaneously established power of vovoda as a representative of the central government²⁵.

Significant attention of D. I. Bagaliy was devoted to the issue of the creation by the Moscow state of the system of fortifications, defensive lines. As to Slobids'ka Ukraine, in the opinion of the historian, that the activities of the Russian government at the time of Aleksei Mikhailovich towards Belgorod defence line of the towns and settlements, became a prerequisite for the settlement of the territory to the south of it by Ukrainian immigrants from Commonwealth and other places, and the Slobids'ka Ukraine appeared in the historical scene. Thus, Slobids'ka Ukraine was formed as the area "behind the line" (Belgorod fortifications) and its population

22 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 567.

23 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 173-174.

24 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 195.

25 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 179-180.

consisted mostly of Ukrainians. According D. I. Bagaliy, Ukrainians “... took over the role, which in Belgorod Ukraina [here – border line] was played by Russian served people” Consequently, in Slobids’ka Ukraine Russian (ethnic) colonization occurred at a very slow pace, although existed in the 17th century, because of the interest of the Russian government to take control over the territory behind the actual border²⁶.

In connection with the coverage of the role of Ukrainians in the resettlement on Slobids’ka Ukraine, special interest presents 5 chapter of his monograph which has the title: “Little Russia [malorossijskaya, i. e. Ukrainian] colonization from the time of Aleksei Mikhailovich”²⁷. The historian reveals the issues of the reasons for migration (including tatars and turks attacks on Right-Bank Ukraine), establishment by settlers of towns, *slobod* (free settlements) and different defensive constructions, repeatedly describing the development of local fortifications at the old abandoned settlements far from the Moscow border. It was, according to the historian, a common strategy both the Moscow government and the first settlers-Ukrainians “to protect against Tatars”²⁸. Such approach turned almost to the tactics of the settlers, who were motivated to restoring the old abandoned settlements, distant from the borders of the Moscow State or for posts by the need for protection “during the emergence of the Crimean and Nogai Tatars or other warrior men” and the difficulty of overcoming distance in case of need to Belgorod and Chuguev. Such “restored” settlements there were Kharkiv, Tor (Slov’yans’k) etc.²⁹. Migrants settled on the so-called Tatar roads (sakma’s).

Important observation of the historian is his conclusion that the difference in the building of towns of the Belgorod Line and Slobids’ka Ukraine was that in the first case it was a consequence of the activities of the government, and in the second case it was the “initiative and energy of the population, with relatively small subsidy from the Treasury”³⁰.

In Slobids’ka Ukraine the strategic role was played even by monasteries (Svyatogors’kyi and others), some of them were located near the Tatar roads, for example Izyum Road. Therefore, they suffered from the attacks of Tatars, informed the government on their movements, and had important strategic significance, being in a specific locus – “behind the Line”. Besides, the monasteries had a specific role on the frontier – they had the responsibility to meet the religious needs of those “Russians” (including Ukrainians) who dedicated themselves to the life of fighting with non-Christians, and were far from other religious centres³¹.

Tatar factor to some extent contributed to the obtaining by Ukrainian settlers to Slobids’ka Ukraine with certain privileges (in contrast to the Russians (of Moscow state) served people), especially from the time of Aleksei Mikhailovich, given the great expenditure of organization

26 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 237-238.

27 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 378.

28 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 416, 424, 436, 438, 476.

29 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 432, 436.

30 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 475.

31 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 509, 513-514, 517, 525.

of border defence for the Moscow state³². Although Slobids'ka Ukraine as well as Belgorod pontificated Line and other Moscow state borderlands, was settled by people with both warrior and agricultural way of life, nevertheless in the towns of Slobids'ka Ukraine a big part of the population did not belong to the estate of military served people and preferred to deal with agriculture, crafts (this was due government privileges and social migrant's structure). According to D. I. Bagaliy at the beginning of the 18th century the local population regarded more and more of their military duties as a burden³³.

The factor of Tatar attacks, continuation of defence war, unsuccessful attempts of the offensive one, fast settling of Slobids'ka Ukraine caused the need to build already for Slobids'ka Ukraine the fortified lines for defence from Tatars, which was, in particular, the Ukrainian line (1730-ies). Its creation had its own peculiarities, the main burden in its building bore Sloboda and Little Russian (i. e. Ukrainian Hetmanate) regiments, the Ukrainians of Belgorod province. The construction of lines was hampered, among other things, by constant attacks by Tatars. Historian compares the process of the construction of Ukrainian and earlier Belgorod fortification line, considers different conflicts of interest, indicates insufficient awareness of its practical necessity (especially in Ukrainians, who were involved in its construction, without the prospect of permanent residence there), as well as the anachronic nature of the Ukrainian line in the 18th century. According to the conclusion of D. I. Bahaliy, the creation of the Ukrainian line did not have protected frontiers from the raids of the Tatars³⁴.

Despite the fact that D. I. Bagaliy in the 1880-ies, as shown above, emphasized the priority role of ethnic Ukrainians in colonization and defence of Slobids'ka Ukraine; he then integrated these problems mostly in the history of the Russian state, with connections with social and national (people) history. In the conditions of Ukrainian national-democratic revolution of 1917-1921 historian, who was representative of Ukrainian movement in times of the empire, has got the possibility to examine the history of Slobids'ka, Ukraine mostly in context of the paradigm of the national history of Ukraine. As a consequence, in 1918 his previous issues and scientific results in researching on the history of Slobids'ka Ukraine appeared in Ukrainian in the edition of some popular and educational character "The History of Slobods'ka Ukraine"³⁵.

"The History of Slobods'ka Ukraine" was structured on the basis of problem principle, not chronological as previous D. I. Bagaliy's work "Essays from the history of colonization of the steppe outskirts of the Moscow state" (1887).

The question of interrelations with Tatars revealed in special chapter 3 with quite saying title: "Fighting with the Tatars"³⁶. In this work for mass reader D. I. Bagaliy once again stressed

32 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 446-447, 456.

33 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 483, 499-500.

34 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 251, 294-295, 298-299, 305, 309, 334, 340, 481.

35 D. I. Bagaliy, *Istoriia Slobids'koi Ukrainy (Pamiatky istorychnoi dumky Ukrainy)*, Kharkiv: Osnova 1991, p. 13-14.

36 Bagaliy, *ibid.*, p. 48-62.

on the fact that "... Slobids'ka Ukraine was suffering from the Tatar attacks anyway not less, but rather more, than belgorod and voronezh ukrainas [i. e. territorial edges, outskirts] of Moscow state"³⁷. At the same time the historian stated that "...we have to remember all the time that Slobyds'ka Ukraine led against the Tatars only defensive struggle and was very interested in peace (agreement) and in quiet development of culture"³⁸ (the historian the meaning of the term "culture" connected with different aspects).

4. Southern Ukraine as Frontier in the Cases of Historians of 19th Century Presentations

In addition to highlighting the history of "Moscow's moving border" and Slobids'ka Ukraine, D. I. Bagaliy appeals to the history of other fragments, imagining a great frontier between the Volga and Dnieper (like Right-Bank Ukraine, Southern Ukraine). Taking into consideration that he paid special attention to Southern Ukraine, it is a worthy theme for thorough revealing in our article. This region D. I. Bagaliy started to study as a Frontier theme in the whole also in 1880-ies and for him it was then so called in administrative terms New Russia region (Novorossiiskii krai) (now it is the territory of Southern Ukraine). The South of Ukraine became for the historian a part of the Big Frontier with Wild Field or Steppe, as we have mentioned his main approach above, and was the subject of his work "Colonization of the New Russia region and its first steps along the path of culture" (1889).

Taking this problem, D. I. Bagaliy was largely a follower of A. O. Skal'kovs'kyi, who yet in the first half of the 19th century studied the history of the southern Steppe³⁹ or, in administrative terms for him, the dominant part of the New Russia region (Kherson, Ekaterynoslav and Taurian provinces without Crimea) and part of Bessarabia. Another determination made by the historian for the "Steppe" included the territory between "the Don mouth, Black and Azov Seas, the mouth of the Danube and West-Ukrainian border" (here it means Right-Bank Ukraine in Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth)⁴⁰.

If concerning other parts of the Frontier, D. I. Bagaliy often used the notion Wild Field, when he speaks on Southern Ukraine, he often accepted the term "Steppe", loved also by A. O. Skal'kovs'kyi. In A. O. Skal'kovs'kyi's interpretation (who could use certain tradition), the Steppe arised as a frontier, where two civilizations met (Christian and Muslim), and their opposition led to the emergence of the Cossacks (as Cossack Orthodox order). A. Skal'kovs'kyi, as subsequently and D. I. Bagaliy, was watching the so-called "Russian penetration"⁴¹ (as a

37 Bagaliy, *ibid.*, p. 51.

38 Bagaliy, *ibid.*, p. 62.

39 Novikova, «Istoriograph» Apollon Skal'kovs'kyi, p. 233-234.

40 A. A. Skal'kovskii, *Khronologicheskoe obozrieniie*, p. 3; A. A. Skal'kovskii, *Opyt statisticheskogo opisaniia Novorossiiskogo kraia*, Odessa: V tip. L. Nitche 1850, t. I, p. 9-10; Novikova, *Pravo volodity terytoriei*, pp. 78-100.

41 A. A. Skal'kovskii, *Piervoie tridsatilietie istorii goroda Odessa, 1793-1823*, Odessa: Gor. tip. 1837, p. 3.

result of folk colonization and state policy) in the Steppe in the 18th century, and in the case of Zaporozhian Cossacks – practically from the 16th century. It should be noted that the term “Russian” both historians often used in the ambivalent meaning which included both Russians and Ukrainians. One of the tasks of A. O. Skal’kovs’kyi was in covering the changes of historical epochs in the South of modern Ukraine (on the example of history of Odesa – from paganism (ancient Greeks) to Islam, and then – to the victory of Christianity)⁴². His works focused not only on the colonization and the state conquest of the south, the construction of fortresses, Russian-Turkish wars during the confrontation with the Tatars and the Turks. He also revealed what kind of political community (Zaporozhian Sich) emerged as a result of the specificity of confrontation in the Steppe (of struggle for Steppe), as well as the transformation made after the conquest of the Steppe by the Russian Empire. Also, for him, the Steppe was a frontier not only of the Russian state, or the so-called “Russian” people (including Ukrainians), the Zaporozhian Sich with Tatars and Turks. It is also a frontier between Asia and Europe, between Christianity and Islam. He stressed that initiators of conflicts with Cossacks often Tatars (Nogai) were, called by historians, the first line of Hanate. Instead, the Cossacks were forced to lead a defensive struggle. But also for this historian, it was clear that frontier interrelations were more complicate and there were reasons which made these two sides closer to each other or made them opposite each other⁴³.

As to D. I. Bagaliy, he paid the history of south frontier less attention, in contrast the history of Slobids’ka Ukraine and “ukrainas” (edges, outskirts) of the Moscow state of the 17th – 18th century. The historian covered the history of the New Russia region (Southern Ukraine) mostly through a more priority approach of the history of settling the territory, or its colonization. Having studied a significant base of sources, D. I. Bagaliy followed his methodology in studying Slobids’ka Ukraine and the bigger Frontier with Wild Field, starting with the characteristics of the geography of Steppe and already in these materials gave the information concerning “the neighborhood of Tatars”. According to the conclusion of the scientist, the geography of New Russia Steppes determined their historical destiny as the territory of nomadic peoples, which in the times of Rus’ were represented by Pechenigs, Black Klobuks, Polovtsians, Tatars, and the New Russia Steppe itself on the east passed into the Asian steppes, due to which and special nature conditions it became the way for the nomads⁴⁴.

Then he turns to the reasons and obstacles for colonization of the steppe by “Russian settlers” in the 16th – 17th centuries. Among them he pointed out on the one hand on nature difficulties⁴⁵, on the other hand, D. I. Bagaliy stated that to settle in the Steppe, it was necessary

42 A. A. Skal’kovskii, “Chetyrie stranitsy Odesskoi lietopisi”, *Odesskii almanac na 1839 g.*, Odessa 1839, pp. 607-618 Novikova, «Istoriograph» Apollon Skal’kovs’kyi, p. 332; Novikova, Khadzhybeis’ka tematyka, pp. 99-102.

43 Novikova, Kryms’kyi chynnyk, p. 58-59; Novikova, «Istoriograph» Apollon Skal’kovs’kyi, p. 378-404.

44 D. I. Bagaley, *Kolonizatsiia Novorossiiskogo kraia i pervye shagi iego po puti kultury: istiricheskii etiud*, Kiev: Tipografiia G. T. Korchak-Novitskogo 1889, p. 5.

45 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 15-18.

to re-conquer it from the Tatars, who appeared in the Steppe in the 13th century (we met this position above). As their bastion, the historian regarded the Crimean Khanate, the conquest of which, according to him, was the historical task of the Russian state, since the 16th century, and ended in 1783.

Of special interest there was the description by D. I. Bahaliy the Tatar territory from 13th to 16th centuries, when they possessed the “New Russia Steppe” (Southern Ukraine Steppe), the historian underlined that northern borders of their nomads’ camps reached even the territory of Kharkiv and Poltava provinces which also were the Wild Field. The historian noted that if anyone wanted to permanently settle in the Steppe – “they had to lead the constant struggle both with Tatars, who considered Steppes as their property and with Nature”⁴⁶.

According to D. I. Bagaliy, till the second half of the 18th century in the south Steppe, it was possible to settle only in the zone of the security – on the Dnieper islands, having semi-nomadic, semi-settled way of life, and this process the Cossacks started in the 16th century. Therefore, the Tatars’ danger with other factors determined the beginning of colonization of South Steppe in the “river valley”⁴⁷.

Unlike the characteristics of the residents of Slobids’ka Ukraine, D. I. Bagaliy stressed that Zaporozhian Cossacks waged not only a self-defense war with Tatars, but also offensive: Cossacks “recaptured” Steppe from the Tatars, leading a permanent guerrilla war and Cossack territory with time spread at the expense of “Wild Field”, “Tatar steppes”⁴⁸.

Special attention the historian paid to types of and the number of Cossack settlements in the territory of the Zaporozhian Sich (Katerynoslav and Kherson provinces, without the territory between the Bug and the Dniester), it is noteworthy that sometimes the Tatar factor influenced on creation the settlements (when their residents were released by Cossacks *yasyr*). As for Sloboda Cossacks, D. I. Bagaliy concludes about the Zaporozhian Cossacks, that in recent years of their “historical existence” they moved to peaceful economic occupations. The historian indicates that Zaporozhian Cossacks as “...the stronghold of the Russian world from the Muslim word, did a lot for the *defence* of Russian culture...” and for further *creation* of Russian culture (the term “Russian” included then both Ukrainian and Russian features)⁴⁹.

In the context of the history of the southern Steppe frontier D. I. Bagaliy also paid a lot of attention to the politics of the Russian government, connected with construction of fortified settlements, fortresses, with special regulations of the migration process etc.⁵⁰. He concluded that in this region fortresses played a smaller role, because in 1783 the danger of permanent guerrilla war with Tatars disappeared (when the Crimean Khanate was captured

46 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 18, 20.

47 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 20-21.

48 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 23.

49 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 27, 29.

50 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 32-35.

by Russian empire). D. I. Bagaliy estimated this as a positive situation for the possibility of culture (as agriculture, industry, trade, mental activity) developing in Steppe which had little space for developing in the period of Cossack struggle against Tatars danger in the 16th – the first half of 18th centuries⁵¹.

So, for historiography of the 19th century the methodological searches were inherent in the time when history was becoming a contemporary science. One manifestation of this process was the formation of the regional (“oblast”) school of historical studies, which is often associated with the name of the Ukrainian historian V. B. Antonovych. At the same time a separate historiographical direction was formed, which can be called a Frontier approach. His representatives (in particular, A. O. Skal'kovs'kyi, D. I. Bagaliy) considered not only the history of the regions (including Slobids'ka Ukraine, Southern Ukraine), but the phenomenon of moving borders in the contact area of the Slavs, Tatars, Turks and others (depending on the historical period). They have studied in most cases historical peculiarities and, in the end, visual disappearance of the Slavic-Turkic Frontier, which, however, in some way continued its existence in some realities and historical memory.

Often this direction was marginalized on the background of defining by the historians their tasks as studying the history of the colonization of certain regions. At the same time, the study allows to determine this direction as separate and important from methodological point of view for revealing the influence of Slavic-Turkic contacts for the history of the state and society on the Frontier, where the different cultures and interests were opposed or interacted. That all influenced the local historical process, as well as on the fate of the frontier itself.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış bağımsız.

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

Finansal Destek: Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

Bibliography

- A. Skal'kovskii, “Chetyrie stranitsy Odesskoi lietopisi”, *Odesskii almanach na 1839 g.*, Odessa 1839.
 A. Skal'kovskii, *Khronologicheskoe obozrieniie istori Novorossiiskogo kraia*, Odessa: V Gor. tip. 1836, t. 1.
 A. Skal'kovskii, *Opyt statisticheskogo opisaniia Novorossiiskogo kraia*, Odessa: V tip. L. Nitche 1850, t. I.
 A. Skal'kovskii, *Piervoie tridtsatilietie istorii goroda Odessy, 1793-1823*, Odessa: Gor. tip. 1837.

51 Bagaley, *ibid.*, p. 109.

- D. Bagaley, *Istoriia Severskoi zemli do poloviny XIV st.*, Kiev: V universitetskoj tipografii (I. I. Zavads'kogo) 1882.
- [D. I. Bagaley], *Materialy dlia istorii kolonizatsii i byta Kharkovskoi i otchasti Kurskoi i Voroniezhs'koj gubernii*, Kharkov: Tipografiia K. P. Schastni 1890, [t. II].
- D. I. Bagaley, *Kolonizatsiia Novorossiiskogo kraia i pervyie shagi iego po puti kultury: istoricheskii etiud*, Kiev: Tipografiia G. T. Korchak-Novitskogo 1889.
- D. I. Bagaley, *Materialy dlia istorii kolonizatsii i byta stepnoi okrainy Moskovskogo gosudarstva (Kharkovskoi i otchasti Kurskoi i Voroniezhs'koj gubernii) v XVI – XVIII stoliatii*, Kharkov: Tipografiia K. P. Schastni 1886, [t. I].
- D. I. Bagaliy, *Istoriia Slobids'koi Ukrainy (Pamiatky istorychnoi dumky Ukrainy)*, Kharkiv: Osnova 1991.
- Dmitrii Ivanovich Bagaley, *Ocherki iz istorii kolonizatsii stepnoi okrainy Moskovskogo gosudarstva. Izdaniie imp. Obshchestva istorii i drevnosti Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, Moskva: V Universitet. tip. (M. Katkov) 1887.
- Liudmyla Novikova, "Khadzhybeis'ka tematyka v pratsiakh odes'kogo doslidnyka A. O. Skal'kov's'kogo (1808-1898)", *«Kochubeiv-Khadzhybei-Odesa»: materialy Pershoi Vseukrains'koi naukovoï konferencii, prysviachenoï 600-chchu mista, m. Odesa, 28-29 travnia 2015 r.*, Odesa 2015.
- Liudmyla Novikova, "Kryms'kyi chynnyk v istorii kozatstva u zobrazhenni istorykiv pershoi polovyny XIX st.", *Chornomors'ka mynuvshyna*, Odesa 2010, vol. 5.
- Liudmyla Novikova, "Pravo volodyty terytoriiu «Bessarabii» u XX – na pochatku XX st.: skladne perepletinnia argumentiv zatsikavlenykh storin v umovakh regionu-frontyru", *Chornomors'ka mynuvshyna*, Odesa 2017, vol. 12.
- Liudmyla Novikova, "Pytannia pokhodjennia, sutnosti ta istorii kozatstva v pratsiakh rosiis'kogo istoryka S. M. Solovyova", *Chornomors'ka mynuvshyna*. Odesa 2011. vol. 6
- Liudmyla Novikova, *«Istoriograph» Apollon Skal'kov's'kyi: intelektual'na apologia impers'koi polityky ta regional'noi istorychnoi samobutnosti*, Odesa: Odes'kyi natsional'nyi universytet 2012.
- Olena Mykolaivna Bogdashyna, "D. I. Bagaliy u suchasniï ukrains'kii istoriografii", *Visnyk Kharkivs'kogo natsional'nogo universitetu imeni V. N. Karazina. Seriia: Istoriia Ukrainy. Ukrainoznavstvo: isnorychni ta filosof's'ki nauky*, 2017, vol. 25.
- Olena Mykolaivna Bogdashyna, "Slobids'kyi litopysec' istorii Ukrainy D. I. Bagaliy", *Ukrains'kyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2008, № 1.
- Petro Pyrig, "D. I. Bahaliy iak doslidnyk istorii Slobozhanshchyny", *Akademiia pamiaty professora Volodymyra Antonovycha*, Kyiv 1994.
- Vladimir Vasilievich Kravchenko, *Dmitrii Ivanovich Bagalei: nauchnaia i obshchestvenno-politicheskaia deiatel'nost'*, Kharkov: Osnova 1990.
- Volodymyr Vasyliovych Kravchenko, "D. I. Bahaliy: shliakh zolotoi seredyny (do 140-richchia z dnia narodzhennia)", *Drjevnosti. Harkovskij istoriko-arheologičeskij ežegodnik*, Kharkov 1999, [vol.] 1997-1998.
- Volodymyr Vasyliovych Kravchenko, "Slavnykh pradivid velykykh...", *D. I. Bagaliy, Istoriia Slobids'koi Ukrainy*, Kharkiv: Osnova 1991.