

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](https://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS)

International Scientific Journal
Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2025 Issue: 10 Volume: 150

Received: 01.10.2025
Accepted/Published: 30.10.2025 <https://T-Science.org>



Yulia Igorevna Prokhorova

Institute of Service and entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
Bachelor, Shakhty, Russia

Arthur Alexandrovich Blagorodov

Institute of Service and entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
postgraduate student

Natalia Sergeevna Rumyantseva

Institute of Service and entrepreneurship (branch) DSTU
PhD, Associate Professor

Svetlana Yurievna Korablina

LLC CPOSN Ortomoda
Candidate of Technical Sciences, Associate Professor, Deputy. director

Galina Yurievna Volkova

LLC CPOSN Ortomoda
Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor, Gen. principal,
Moscow, Russia

FEATURES OF THE STUDY OF THE PHENOMENON OF COSSACKS IN RUSSIA

Abstract: This article presents the results of a historiographical study of the entire body of research and publications devoted to Cossack issues, including scientific and popular literature, memoirs, fiction, legal, military, religious, reference, and other publications. It charts the history of the study of the Cossack phenomenon in Russia, beginning with the first mentions of Cossacks in Russian chronicles and continuing until the collapse of the USSR in the late 20th century. The emergence and development of a distinct Cossack historiographic tradition is examined separately. Particular attention is paid to the evolution of émigré Cossack historiography in the 20th century.

Key words: historiography, hypostasis, Orthodoxy, ethnocultural, demand, immunity, demography, political science, White Cossacks, Cossacks, geopolitical, stereotypical, sovereign, phenomenon, frontier.

Language: English

Citation: Prokhorova, Yu.I., Blagorodov, A.A., Rumyantseva, N.S., Korablina, S.Yu., & Volkova, G.Yu. (2025). Features of the study of the phenomenon of Cossacks in Russia. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 10 (150), 22-44.

Soi: <https://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-10-150-3> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2025.10.150.3>

Scopus ASCC: 2000.

Introduction

UDC 930.47:836.78.

The Russian Empire and its Orthodox-messianic ideology "didn't see" ethnic differences, but rather "noticed" only the religious affiliations of the empire's

peoples. The social system of old Russia was structured along class lines. Therefore, within the empire's structure, the Cossacks functioned primarily as a military-serving class. During this same historical period, alongside the development of Russian historiography, a scholarly understanding of the

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Cossack phenomenon began, along with the first attempts to answer questions about its historical roots, origins, and social and ethnic nature. Historical material was accumulated, and early sources were studied.

The first dedicated study of Cossack history and culture was the monograph by Alexander Ivanovich Rigelman, who became the "first Cossack historiographer." The most detailed and comprehensive study to date of A.I. Rigelman's life and scholarly work is presented in a special article by P.A. Avakov, to which we refer the interested reader. Here, we will limit ourselves to a brief biographical sketch. Very little is reliably known about the future historian's background. Even the names of his parents remain unknown. The official list states that Alexander Rigelman "was of German descent, the son of a senior officer, of the Greek faith, and owned no villages or peasants." Rigelman was born in 1714 (according to other sources, 1720) to a noble family and was orphaned at an early age. According to Rigelman's first biographer and author of prefaces to his monographs, O. M. Bodyansky, in 1730 Rigelman was assigned to the Noble Corps, where he received a military engineering and general education in the spirit of the time. However, P. A. Avakov, based on a study of archival documents, reasonably believes that Rigelman actually studied at the St. Petersburg Engineering School.

In military service, Riegelman participated in the Turkish campaigns as part of the main army of Field Marshal B.K. Minich, in the Battle of Stavuchany (August 28, 1739), and in the capture of Khotin (August 30) and Iasi (September 12). After the war, Riegelman was sent to "demarcate lands with the Ottoman Porte" in the south – from the mouth of the Sinyukha to the Dnieper, Mius, and Azov. Probably as a result of the successful completion of this important assignment, Riegelman received the next rank of engineer-ensign. From 1745 to 1749, he "made a border map from Kyiv to Smolensk and drew up plans with designs for Little Russian towns of the Prilutsky, Lubensky, and Mirgorodsky regiments, as well as for towns bordering Poland and the construction of the Vasilyevsky, Obukhov, Tripolsky, and Staikovsky border retrenchments near Kyiv." In 1749, Rigelman was promoted to the rank of engineer-second lieutenant and then sent to the Orenburg line, and then carried out diplomatic missions in the Kirghiz-Kaisak Horde under Nurali Khan.

"Following this, in 1751–1752, he repaired and rebuilt the Poyaitskaya, Samara, Sakmarskaya, Verkhoyskaya, and Uyskaya fortresses, all the way to the Tobol-Ishim line in Western Siberia. On April 25, 1752, Riegelman was promoted to lieutenant. The following year, the engineer was sent from Orenburg to Tsaritsyn, then to Krasny Yar, in 1754 to Astrakhan, in 1756 back to Tsaritsyn, and in 1757 to Kizlyar, where he developed an interest in research

and first took up his pen.

In 1758, Rigelman was promoted to captain and then returned to Orenburg. That same year, he completed his first historical work, "An Explanation of the Kizlyar Fortress," which, among other things, covered the origins of the Greben and Terek Cossacks. Unfortunately, this work has not survived. From Orenburg in 1761, Rigelman departed for the Fortress of St. Anna on the Don to oversee the construction of the new Fortress of St. Demetrius of Rostov, intended to become the main Russian outpost on the Azov section of the border with Turkey. It was during these years that Rigelman began studying the history, culture, and ethnography of the Don Cossacks. In 1763, Rigelman was summoned to St. Petersburg, where he was received by Empress Catherine II, to whom he personally presented his plans for military fortifications. For his services, Rigelman was awarded a gold snuffbox filled with chervonets and a dress for his wife "from the Tsar's shoulder."

In 1770, he was entrusted with the construction of the Petrovskaya Fortress on the Sea of Azov. In 1770, Riegelman was promoted to colonel, and on December 28, 1771, to major general. On November 25, 1770, he was awarded the Cross of St. George and the Order of St. George, IV Class. In 1772, Riegelman again took part in military operations during the next Russo-Turkish War, serving in the army under the command of the renowned Field Marshal P. A. Rumyantsev. On June 18, 1773, he participated in the unsuccessful attack on Silistria, but distinguished himself in the capture of the mountain and retrenchment lying before the city.

After the end of the war and the conclusion of the Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainarjik, Riegelman was sent to the Don, where, according to P. A. Avakov, he was "appointed commander of the Azov Department of Fortresses—a kind of Azov military engineering district, the center of which was the fortress of St. Demetrius, the largest in the region." Riegelman held this position from 1774 to 1782. During these years, the scholar managed to collect a wealth of material on the history and culture of the Cossacks in general, and the Don Cossacks in particular. In 1778, he completed his monograph, "History or Narrative of the Don Cossacks." After this, the historian began work on his follow-up book, "The Chronicle Narrative of Little Russia and Its People, and the Cossacks in General."

After 52 years of impeccable service, on August 7, 1782, at the age of 68, engineer, major general, and cavalier Alexander Rigelman retired with a pension of one thousand rubles a year. He settled on his second wife's small estate, the village of Andreyevka, twenty miles from Chernigov. Here he lived virtually without leaving until his death. Rigelman devoted his final years to studying the history of Little Russia and the Cossacks. A. I. Rigelman died on October 23, 1789, and was buried in the stone church he built in his village of Andreyevka, Chernigov Governorate.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Rigelman's works were published much later, half a century after his death. They were published in the journal "Readings in the Society of Russian History and Antiquities." This is "The History, or Narrative of the Don Cossacks, When and Where They Originated, and at What Time and from What People They Settled on the Don, What Their Deeds Were and What They Were Famous for, etc., Collected and Compiled from Many of the Most Reliable Russian and Foreign Historians, Chronicles, Ancient Palace Records, and from the Journal of Peter the Great, Through the Works of Engineer-Major-General and Cavalier Alexander Rigelman, 1778" and "The Chronicle Narrative of Little Russia and Its People and the Cossacks in General, Whence and from What People They Originate, and According to What Occurrences They Now Inhabit Their Places, Such as: Circassian or Little Russian and Zaporozhian, and from them the Don, and from these the Yaik, Which Are Now the Ural, Greben, Siberian, Volga, Terek, Nekrasov, and Other Cossacks, as well as the Sloboda Regiments. Collected and compiled from the works of engineer-major-general and cavalier Alexander Rigelman, 1783–86." Both monographs were published with prefaces by O. M. Bodyansky, the first researcher of A. I. Rigelman's work and biographer. Unfortunately, other works by Rigelman, such as "Explanation of the Kizlyar Fortress, compiled in 1757," a collection of historical anecdotes about Peter the Great, and possibly many others, remained unpublished at that time. As a result, these works by Rigelman are apparently irretrievably lost to historical scholarship.

Main part

Since Rigelman's works remained unpublished for a long time, the first Russian publications on Cossack history and culture can be dated to the first quarter of the 19th century. This was a time of flourishing for Russian culture as a whole, known in history as the "Golden Age" or "Pushkin's Time." This era was characterized by a broad public interest (naturally, within the aristocratic society of the time) in Russian history and culture. This spiritual, cultural, and patriotic upsurge was a direct consequence of the glorious era of the Napoleonic Wars and, especially, the Patriotic War of 1812. It was in the heroic battles of these years that the Cossacks, led by the legendary "Whirlwind Ataman" Platov, earned not only Russian but also European fame.

Recognized throughout Europe as the greatest of military leaders, Napoleon called the Cossacks the finest light cavalry in the world, and once, only by a miracle, he himself escaped capture. This incident features in a vivid passage in Caulaincourt's memoirs. We will allow ourselves to cite a short excerpt from these memoirs, recounting an incident that occurred during the Battle of Maloyaroslavets. "It was just beginning to dawn, and 500 toises from headquarters,

we came face to face with the Cossacks, whose main detachment had attacked the artillery detachment and artillery units ahead of us, having heard their movement. The Cossacks captured several guns." Caulaincourt goes on to explain how this nighttime incident occurred: "It was still so dark that we only realized what was happening from the Cossacks' shouts, and we found ourselves mixed in with some of them before we realized who they were." Admittedly, we were far too far removed from the possibility of encountering Cossacks among our guards' bivouacs to pay much attention to the first cries we heard. Only when the cries grew louder and began to be heard near the Emperor did General Rapp, riding ahead with Count Lauriston, Count Lobaud, Count Duronel, the officers on duty, and the advance guard, gallop up to the Emperor and say to him:

– Stop, sir, these are Cossacks!

– "Take the rangers from the convoy," the emperor answered him, "and push forward.

No more than 10 or 12 riflemen remained near us, and they themselves were already pushing forward to join the vanguard." Ultimately, only two men remained to directly defend Napoleon: Caulaincourt himself and the Prince of Neuchâtel. The memoirist recalls how, together with Napoleon, "all three of us held naked swords in our hands," while the battle raged "closer and closer to the Emperor," when they were finally rescued by the approaching squadrons of the Guard, which engaged in a fierce battle with "a whole cloud of Cossacks." Only with the onset of dawn did the astonished French see that around the Emperor "the entire plain and road were swarming with Cossacks." Caulaincourt then goes on to discuss at length the mortal danger that threatened Napoleon, and how only a lucky chance saved the Emperor from certain death in the very heart of his Grand Army. The memoirist states that it would be difficult to believe the veracity of this episode if it "could not be confirmed by the entire army and so many trustworthy people." As a result of a subsequent analysis of this episode, a detailed description of the structure of the imperial convoy and the combat security system adopted by the French army, Caulaincourt comes to the conclusion that "Cossacks are undoubtedly the best light troops in the world for outpost guarding an army, for reconnaissance and guerrilla raids." He supports this conclusion with a number of considerations about the military merits of the Cossacks, their unrivaled horsemanship, the superior training and maintenance of Cossack horses, and other similar qualities. General Morand, like Caulaincourt, who participated in the war with Russia in 1812, recalled: "What a magnificent spectacle the European cavalry presented, glittering with gold and steel in the rays of the June sun, stretched out along the banks of the Neman, full of ardor and courage! "And what a bitter memory of the futile movements, exhausted in pursuit of the Cossacks, hitherto despised and having

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

done more to save Russia than her entire army. They were visible every day on the horizon, stretched out in an endless line, while scouts approached our ranks. We formed up and advanced on this line, which disappeared just as we approached, leaving only birches and firs visible on the horizon. But an hour later, while we were feeding the horses, the attack would resume, and the black line would unfold anew. We would advance again, and again the same consequences. And thus the finest and bravest cavalry was exhausted and melted away by the actions of warriors they considered unworthy of them, yet whose efforts were sufficient to save the empire, of which they are the true bulwark and savior. To our shame, it must be added that our cavalry was more numerous than the Cossacks, and was further reinforced by the lightest and best artillery..." One can cite many more similar examples from the memoirs and testimonies of contemporaries and participants in the war of 1812.

During the Russian army's overseas campaign, the Cossacks attracted widespread attention in Europe due to their exceptionally high combat qualities. The unusual appearance, unique combat tactics, and high morale of the Russian Cossacks surprised the Europeans. An attempt was even made to organize a Cossack regiment as part of the Prussian cavalry. The Cossacks aroused particular interest in France. The Cossacks aroused no less interest among the ordinary people on the streets of Paris than among the military. Entire series of drawings dedicated to genre scenes involving Cossacks in Paris have been preserved. The memory of the Cossacks still lives on in France in the name of the famous Parisian "bistros", which comes from the Cossack word for "quickly-quickly". The French interest in the Cossacks was also demonstrated by such facts as the enrollment of individual Frenchmen into the Cossack class in Russia, the first such case taking place soon after the war of 1812. Moreover, as the authors managed to discover, there were also such cases when the French citizen Louis Leonardo volunteered to join the Russian Cossacks in the distant Caucasus. It should be noted that enrollment into the Cossack class implied a change of citizenship and an oath of lifelong and hereditary service for oneself and one's children. On the wave of this military (and intelligence), political and public interest, both in Europe and in Russia, the first large studies devoted to the Cossacks, their history and culture were published.

It should also be noted that during that historical period—from the early 19th to the early 20th centuries—the "Cossack question" was not only a matter of academic and historical significance, but was, above all, of military, strategic, and political interest. While studying and assessing the economic, social, organizational, and, ultimately, military potential of Cossack military societies, such as the Don, Ural, Terek, and Kuban Cossack Hosts, foreign researchers were interested in identifying and fully

assessing the military significance of the corresponding Cossack cavalry contingents in potential future wars and conflicts. It is no coincidence that domestic reports on Cossack regions were divided into two parts—open and secret. For example, "Report of the Commander of the Kuban Region and the Ataman of the Kuban Cossack Host for 1895, or the Most Humble Report of the Commander of the Terek Region and the Ataman of the Terek Cossack Host for 1891." Furthermore, we should also consider the political considerations, such as those Napoleon had in initiating the work of Lesure (Lesur). This French publicist and historian of the Cossacks will be discussed later. For now, let's note that Napoleon wanted to attract the Cossacks to his side, or at least initiate something akin to a new Pugachev rebellion or Bulavin's rebellion in Russia. It must be said that the Russian autocrats also undoubtedly had their own political views and concerns regarding the Cossack issue.

As a result, obtaining accurate documentary information for European and, in part, Russian researchers of those years was associated with great difficulties. And if obtaining information on the organizational structure of the Cossack troops, the state of the horse stock, the order of staffing units and similar data was difficult, then European authors had to pay even more attention to collecting and analyzing available material on the socio-economic, cultural, etc. development of the Cossack regions.

The same considerations of military secrecy limited the objectivity of domestic sources, including classified ones. This should be taken into account both when analyzing domestic historiography and archival sources. We will return to this issue below when examining Sukhorukov's biography and the fate of his works. For now, it can be noted that the information contained in the works of European authors of the 19th century is of undoubted interest. They provide an opportunity for a comparative analysis of factual data, although, of course, preference should be given to Russian documents and materials.

Here it is appropriate to make another remark concerning the peculiarities of translating historical texts of the 19th century into modern Russian. Such translation sometimes encounters certain difficulties in terms of the precise interpretation of certain terms. The fact is that in such a specific issue, taking into account the direct and reverse translation (from Russian into French and vice versa), preference should be given to dictionaries of pre-revolutionary editions. This allows one to correctly understand the context, taking into account the differences between the Russian official business language of document flow of that time and the peculiarities of the Russian literary language of the first half of the 19th century, which contained many borrowings from French.

One of the first fundamental special works devoted to the study of the Cossacks and their history

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

was the "History of the Cossacks" by the above-mentioned Lesure, which he probably began work on on the eve of Napoleon's invasion of Russia, and was published in Paris only in 1814. Charles-Louis Lesure, or as he is often called in Russian historiography, Lesur, was born in 1770 and died in 1849. This publicist and employee of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs received great fame as the author of the scandalous "testament of Peter I", set out in the anonymous book "On the growth of Russian power from its inception to the beginning of the 19th century". It is believed that this book was written on the personal instructions of Napoleon during his preparations for war with Russia. It can be assumed that the history of the Cossacks was also ordered by the ministry to Lesure on the orders of Napoleon. In any case, political reasons are clearly visible in Lesure's book. For example, the opposition between "good Cossacks" and "evil Muscovites".

The full title of the two-volume work is "The History of the Cossacks, Preceding Their Appearance, or a Look at the Peoples Who Lived in the Land of the Cossacks Before the Tatar Invasion." In this voluminous two-volume monograph (over 800 pages), the author aims to explore the phenomenon of the Cossacks. Lesyur attempts to describe the conditions of the Cossacks' emergence, their ethnographic and historical roots, and explores their history from pre-Mongol times up until 1813. The study also presents the geography and organization of Cossack troops in Russia at the author's time, which undoubtedly had not only political but also military-strategic considerations in mind. A striking example of this is the detailed listing of rivers and even small streams.

Traditionally, historiography attributes Lesure's work to Ukraine and the Ukrainian Cossacks. However, this is not entirely accurate. While Lesure certainly devotes considerable attention to the history of Ukraine, he also examines other Cossack troops. And let's consider another fact. For the French (as well as other Europeans) of the early 19th century, the Cossacks were seen as a single, undivided mass of Asian horsemen. The term "Cossacks" also applied to the Don Cossacks, Bashkirs, Kalmyks, and all other irregular troops of the Russian Empire. Lesure linked the origins of the Cossack people to the Polovtsians and other peoples. But, in any case, for this author, the Cossacks were neither "Muscovites" nor Russians.

Let us cite several examples of Lesyur's discussion of the history and current status of the Cossacks in Russia. Thus, in Chapter IV of Volume II, devoted to the Cossacks of the Terek, Volga, Ural, and Siberia, Lesyur describes the governance of the Terek Cossacks, whose origins date back centuries. Here he describes the Terek Cossacks as accustomed to harsh service conditions, well-versed in the local conditions and topography of the North Caucasus, and highly mobile defenders of Russia's southern borders.

Chapter III of Volume II is devoted to the history of the Black Sea Cossacks. Here, one can note that Lesyur very precisely (correctly naming even small rivers) describes the geography of the "location of the Black Sea Cossacks." Their lands, according to him, were located along the Black Sea coast, from the Don River and the Salsk steppes to the Kuban River valley, and constituted "a wild land crossed by the small rivers Kalaus, Yegorlyk, and others." The author then describes the region's natural conditions, the peoples inhabiting it, and the living conditions of the Black Sea Cossacks. It's interesting to note that Lesyur compares the general situation in the North Caucasus during those years to that in North America, comparing the highlanders to North American Indians and the Cossacks to the first colonists.

Naturally, the Cossacks' European fame and the interest they garnered from Europeans, both allies and adversaries, could not go unnoticed in Russia. But in Russia itself, at this time, as we have already noted, a patriotic and cultural upsurge was underway, with growing interest in its own history and national culture. During the "Golden Age" of Russian culture, the Cossacks, as an unusual and distinctive phenomenon, could not help but attract the attention of historians, politicians, and cultural figures.

In 1816, the first book entirely devoted to the history of the Cossacks was published in Russia: A. G. Popov's "History of the Don Host." However, this book cannot be considered a rigorous scholarly study. While "History" included fantastical and legendary accounts of Amazons, Scythians, Hercules, Theseus, and the like, it did not describe the lives and customs of the Cossacks. Overall, it followed the spirit of Karamzin's autocratic historiography, discussing the Cossacks' rebelliousness and rebelliousness.

It should be noted that A.S. Pushkin himself demonstrated a scholarly interest in Russian history in general and the Cossacks in particular. It's enough to recall his specialized historical study, "The History of the Pugachev Rebellion," which served as the basis for his work on "The Captain's Daughter." Furthermore, Pushkin showed a keen interest in the history of the Caucasian War and expressed a desire to meet with A.P. Yermolov to record his memoirs and become "his historiographer."

In this cultural and historical context, we especially need to highlight the research and publication work of Vasily Dmitrievich Sukhorukov, the first Cossack historian from among the Cossacks themselves. Interested readers can find details of his biography in the work of V. Yu. Afiani. Sukhorukov was a hereditary Don Cossack. He was born in Novocherkassk around 1795 and came from a family of Cossack elders, considered equal to nobility in the Russian Empire.

Sukhorukov graduated from the Novocherkassk Gymnasium and three years of study at Kharkov University in 1815, earning a PhD in law. Apparently,

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

at this time, under the influence of professors, notably G. P. Uspensky, who urged the study of one's own country as a counterweight to the "fables of the ancients," Sukhorukov's interest in the history and culture of the Cossacks was awakened. It is worth noting that it was in Kharkov that Sukhorukov encountered a book by the aforementioned A. G. Popov, published there and then, which included those very "fables" about the Amazons and ancient heroes. This encounter, we believe, may have inspired the young graduate to study the history and culture of his own people, and to attempt to write this history scientifically and truthfully.

In 1819, at the request of the Don Army Ataman A.K. Denisov, "with the Highest permission, the so-called "committee on the organization of the Don Army" was temporarily established in Novocherkassk." We will talk about Denisov and his memoirs in detail later, but in the meantime Sukhorukov was appointed to the "committee" in Novocherkassk to prepare a project for military reforms and the demarcation of stanitsa yurts (land holdings) on the Don. The young but gifted lawyer in the committee was tasked with collecting historical and statistical materials and preparing a description of the lands of the Don Army. Since the military archive burned down in a fire, as mentioned above, Sukhorukov traveled around all the military districts. He examined archaeological antiquities, burial mounds, ruins, and conducted a large study of the archives of stanitsa administrations to identify ancient acts from the military history. In particular, Sukhorukov himself examined the Novokhop'yorsk archive. And his assistants, "Messrs. Kushnarev, Kuchero, Posnov and a friend helped him sort out the archives: Cherkassky, Taganrog, Dubovsky, Tsaritsynsky, Astrakhan and former fortresses: Anninskaya and Dmitrievskaya, from where they wrote out all the notable acts related to the history of the Don Army." In addition to archival research, Sukhorukov continued field research - collected ethnographic materials, recorded folk Cossack songs.

During this work, Sukhorukov demonstrated great abilities in scientific research and management, which attracted the attention of the "Chairman of the Commission established for the demarcation of the lands of the Don Host", Major General Ivan Fedorovich Bogdanovich 1st and Adjutant General Alexander Ivanovich Chernyshev (a famous hero of Russian military intelligence, who on the eve of Napoleon's invasion obtained plans for the deployment of the Grand Army in Paris, for which he was expelled by Napoleon, subsequently received the title of count and became Minister of War under Nicholas I).

When leaving for the capital, Chernyshev "took" the talented employee with him. In 1821, Sukhorukov was transferred to St. Petersburg to serve as adjutant to A. I. Chernyshev, head of the Committee for the

Organization of the Don Host in the capital, and was simultaneously commissioned as a cornet in the Life Guards Cossack Regiment. By the autumn of 1823, scholarly articles by the young legal scholar and historian were appearing in "Syn Otechestva" and "Severny Arkhiv." Sukhorukov's first article was titled "A Brief Historical Account of the Former Town of Cherkassk on the Don." In St. Petersburg, Sukhorukov met and collaborated with Karamzin, to whom he passed on some of the materials he had collected for Volume XII of "History of the Russian State." Karamzin advised the young scholar to pay attention to the Moscow Archives of the State Collegium of Foreign Affairs. According to some sources, it was Karamzin who drew Sukhorukov's attention to the ancient origins of the Cossacks, which existed "before Batu." However, Karamzin's view of the Cossacks generally corresponded to the general tenets of the state-monarchist view of Cossack history. The unbridled and disorganized Cossack freebooters, descended from ancient tribal origins, inevitably yielded to the "principles of civilization," "state order," and the like as monarchical statehood and Russian great power developed. Cossack host republics, or "vatags," as a breeding ground for rebelliousness, a refuge for runaway peasants, homeless individuals, and criminals of all kinds, were forced to enter "under the sovereign protection" of the double-headed eagle.

During these same years, Sukhorukov actively entered the cultural, scientific, and literary circles of the capital of the time. He became an active member of the "Free Society of Lovers of Russian Literature." At this society, Sukhorukov delivered a paper entitled "On the Internal State of the Don Cossacks at the End of the 16th Century." It was here, apparently, that he met the future Decembrist A. O. Kornilovich. Together, Sukhorukov published in December 1824 the only issue of the almanac "Russian Antiquity: A Pocket Book for Lovers of the Fatherland for 1825." This book contained two "sections." The first was devoted to the history of Peter the Great and, according to researchers, was penned by Kornilovich. The second "section" was entirely devoted to the history and culture of the Cossacks and was originally titled "The Common Life of the Don Cossacks in the 17th and 18th Centuries." Its author was Sukhorukov, however, his name was not directly mentioned, as V. Yu. Afiani believes, for political and censorship reasons, due to the brewing conflict with Chernyshev due to Sukhorukov publishing in his articles, without the permission of the "higher authorities," references to archival documents to which only he had access.

In his work, Sukhorukov described the history and culture of the Cossacks. He published recordings of folk songs and even included a short dictionary of unique words in the Cossack language. At the same time, Sukhorukov viewed the Cossacks as a distinct people, which he called "Don Cossacks," rather than

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

as a class.

Even contemporaries attached great importance to Sukhorukov's research, saying that before him, Russian society had only the vaguest understanding of the Cossacks' past, their way of life, and culture. Such classics of Russian literature as A.S. Griboyedov and A.S. Pushkin also praised Sukhorukov's work, inviting him to submit articles to *Sovremennik* in a letter dated March 14, 1836. However, the research career of this pioneering Cossack historian was tragic, and he was unable to publish all of his research and the invaluable archival and other historical materials he had collected over many years.

Like many "enlightened people" of those years, Sukhorukov found himself in circles close to the future Decembrists. He became acquainted with Ryleev and Besstuzhev, who were apparently interested in the "revolutionary" sentiments and traditions of the Cossacks. During the uprising itself, Sukhorukov was in Novochoerkassk, where he organized a unique literary circle with a socio-political focus. In the early days of Nicholas I's reign, this was sufficient grounds for persecution. However, Sukhorukov's connection with the Decembrists was never proven. Nevertheless, Sukhorukov's career in the capital came to an end: he was "left on the Don" under strict secret surveillance. During the first years of Nicholas I's reign, Sukhorukov managed to complete his collection of historical and statistical materials on the Don, and in November 1826, he presented a draft historical and statistical description of the Don Cossack land to his immediate superior, General Bogdanovich, before the latter's departure for St. Petersburg.

The following year, Sukhorukov was unexpectedly sent to the Caucasian War and, under strict supervision, on July 27, 1827, was ordered to hand over all documents and materials in his possession: "An order from General Bogdanovich was sent through the ataman Andrianov to Sukhorukov, stating that, by order of the higher authorities, he was being sent from Novochoerkassk to serve in the separate Caucasian corps, and therefore was to hand over all materials in his possession relating to the history and statistics of the Don Army, with a detailed inventory, to the esauls Kushnarev, Kuchеров, and centurion Posnov. Sukhorukov was also instructed to hand over all materials to these officials with complete candor and that not a single one of these papers, or any list or copy of them, should remain undelivered; otherwise, he faced the strictest responsibility before the higher authorities." Sukhorukov was forced to hand over all "reports, materials, semi-finished and rough notebooks of already compiled statistics and history, and every single note." Thus ended the research career of the first Cossack historian.

In 1829, Sukhorukov met Pushkin in person in the Caucasus. Pushkin was deeply interested in the history of the Don Cossacks while preparing his

"History of the Pugachev Rebellion," in which he used, among other things, material from Sukhorukov's article. Even in exile, Pushkin also read "Russkaya Starina," which the poet held in high esteem. According to V. Yu. Afiani, Pushkin lobbied to have Sukhorukov's historical materials returned. The poet mentions this meeting in his "Journey to Arzurum," understandably concealing Sukhorukov's true surname behind the "intelligent and amiable S." Only in 1839 was Sukhorukov able to retire and return to his native Novochoerkassk, where he died shortly thereafter.

Sukhorukov's confiscated materials and manuscripts, meanwhile, were shelved. Only after the end of the latest Russo-Turkish War, in 1830, did General Bogdanovich entrust the completion of the work to the same Kushnarev, Kuchеров, and Posnov, who were able to submit a completed version in 1834, bringing the statistical description up to 1832. Several copies of the work were presented to War Minister A.I. Chernyshev. As the preface to the first edition of "Statistical Description of the Land of the Don Cossacks" very elegantly (from a censorship standpoint) states, both Bogdanovich and Sukhorukov's former collaborators "received the highest awards for their participation in this work. But for some reason, the work itself was not published at the time." It is especially necessary to note that, undoubtedly, the "main work" of Bogdanovich and his subordinates was, in essence, the censorship revision of Sukhorukov's original manuscript, into which various corrections, deletions and additions were made, the identification of which remains an unsolved problem.

Here, it's important to note one circumstance crucial to our research, which allows us to determine the extent of General Bogdanovich's award. The military-administrative system of the Russian Empire had a strict order for military service. Its core principle was the principle of holding positions and promotions. Promotion to the next rank required holding a position, and promotion to a position required promotion to the corresponding rank. This system persists, including in Russian higher education—a system that is inherently very conservative—to this day. Adherence to this principle in practice meant that all officers had seniority in rank. That is, in the case of equal ranks (or, in our terms, titles), the officer who achieved the next rank first had priority. It should be noted that seniority in rank itself could be established retroactively. For example, between two full generals, the one who was first listed as a general is considered senior. He had priority in filling a vacant senior position and, consequently, could be promoted to the next rank. Failure to observe this rule threatened to disrupt the chain of command and, especially, the interaction between adjacent superiors (a similar incident, as contemporaries suspected, occurred with Samsonov and Rennenkampf during World War I,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

which contributed to the 2nd Army's disaster at Tannenberg). This order is somewhat reminiscent of the pre-Petrine custom of "localization." Therefore, the military department (as the discharge department had previously been) closely monitored this entire "bureaucracy" of rank promotion. In particular, relevant reference books, the so-called "lists of generals by seniority," were regularly published. In one of them, for 1840, we find the sought-after General Bogdanovich... "Senator, Lieutenant General since 835, in 834 was awarded a Snuffbox with the monogram of the Name of the Sovereign Emperor, an increase in salary by 1200 rubles. (Instead of 12 years from 835 to 1200 rubles.)"

The historical part of Sukhorukov's work was published only after the Decembrists were pardoned and serfdom was abolished under Alexander II. This work, unattributed, was published under the title "Historical Description of the Don Host" and appeared in two volumes in 1869 and 1872. The preface to the first edition of the "Statistical Description" states that the first volume of the "Historical Description" was published in 1867. However, the copy we discovered in the Harvard University library collection, bearing the bookplate "From the Library of V. G. Druzhinin," indicates the year 1869. As for the "Statistical Description of the Land of the Don Cossacks, Compiled in 1822-32," Sukhorukov's work first saw the light of day only in 1891, more than half a century after the author's death. Moreover, this work again came out "untitled," and Sukhorukov's authorship was mentioned only in the above-cited (and also untitled) "Preface."

The "Sukhorukovsky Story" had another rather curious sequel. According to M. V. Pudavov, who, after a long search, discovered the manuscript of the "Statistical Description" and donated it to the Don Army Museum, the author of the preface was I. T. Semenov, editor of the Oblastnye Vedomosti (Regional News). M. V. Pudavov insisted on co-authorship of the "Statistical Description" with his father, V. M. Pudavov, who worked in the chancery of Bogdanovich's commission.

In 1890, Mikhail Vasilyevich Pudavov published the work of his late father, Vasily Mikhailovich Pudavov, who died suddenly in 1863. In the publisher's preface, M. V. Pudavov detailed the history of this historical work's creation, the lengthy search, and the restoration of the manuscript. In 1898, he published the second part of the manuscript, adding in the preface the story of its creation, loss, and search. V. M. Pudavov's work was published, edited by his son, under the title "History of the Don Host and the Originality of Cossack Principles. The Work of Vasily Mikhailovich Pudavov." As M. V. Pudavov wrote in the preface to his first book, his father began work on the manuscript in the 1840s, almost immediately after the completion of Bogdanovich's committee. Work on the manuscript took more than 20 years, during which

time Pudavov Sr. continued to collect materials on the history of the Don Army and compiled a map of all the Don burial mounds and ancient ruins.

Even in those years, the manuscript was already being read by various educated individuals, including the Military Ataman M. G. Khomutov, Professor Leontyev, and the writer N. V. Kukolnik. Among others, the renowned Cossack historian I. D. Popko read Pudavov's manuscript and gave it a highly favorable review in the "Military Collection" of October 30, 1861. Pudavov Jr. quotes this review verbatim in his preface.

In the historical work of V. M. Pudavov, written in general in accordance with the imperial historiographic tradition, entirely in the spirit of loyalty to the Throne and Orthodoxy, the main idea is expressed about the antiquity of the Cossack family and its noble origin from the ancient "warrior class", and by no means from "runaway peasants".

Pudavov connects the origins of the Cossacks with the Khazar Khaganate. The Cossacks emerged as a service class during that historical period, from Slavs recruited by the Khazars to guard river trade routes and ensure the safety of merchant caravans on the Dnieper, Don, and Volga. It is here that Pudavov sees the origins of "primitive Cossacks," which existed long before the formation of Kievan Rus'. He draws attention to the kinship between the Cherkasy, Circassians, Brodniks, and others, thus tracing the roots of the Ukrainian and Don Cossacks. At the same time, we repeat, Pudavov repeatedly emphasizes the class origins of the Cossacks; he makes no claim to a national identity for the Cossacks, merely relegating the formation of a "Cossack class" to a distant past. At the same time, the author directly links the Cossacks to the Scythian tradition, considering them direct descendants of the Scythians and their martial prowess. Vasily Mikhailovich Pudavov came from the nobility of the Don Host. He was the son of a military sergeant major and was born in 1804. Pudavov did not receive a university education and, like many of his contemporaries, was an enthusiastic historian, local historian, and lover of antiquities, collecting information about burial mounds and other archaeological sites in the Don region. The elder Pudavov completed a four-year gymnasium, but, as his son writes in the preface, "the gymnasium curriculum fell far short of satisfying his intellectual curiosity. The study of the ancient world in all its manifestations and church history were always his favorite subjects of research. To this end, he studied ancient languages (Greek and Latin) and modern ones: French and German. By subscribing to books, he acquired an expensive library, and when visiting St. Petersburg on official business or passing through Moscow, he had the opportunity to review historical documents in the archives and made the necessary extracts."

V. M. Pudavov followed a career typical of the

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Cossack elders of that time. At the age of nine, he was promoted to non-commissioned officer by the legendary Count Platov. He entered active service early – in 1819, when he was only 15. He served in the military chancery, where he was assistant to the military architect. He then joined the "military drafting office" under the familiar "General Staff Major General Bogdanovich I," where he served until 1836. "During this time, I was employed both in clerical work and in compiling maps and plans for the drafting office, pertaining to the affairs of the committee for the organization of the Don Host." In 1826, on committee business, I. F. Bogdanovich sent V. M. Pudavov to St. Petersburg, where he remained until the autumn of the following year. Upon completion of the commission's work in 1834, Pudavov, along with other authors of the historical and statistical description of the Don, was "Most Graciously awarded a diamond ring."¹¹⁴ In 1835, Bogdanovich, having been appointed a senator, took Pudavov with him to St. Petersburg, where he was appointed head of the chancery of the Don Land Survey Commission. Pudavov served in this position for 14 years, then held various administrative and judicial positions in the Don Army and simultaneously served as a member of various commissions and committees.

During these years, Pudavov actively contributed to the press, publishing articles in local and metropolitan publications. Among them are "Voyskovye Vedomosti," "Severnaya Pchela," "Syn Otechestva," and "Sankt-Peterburgskie Vedomosti." His articles also include historical works such as "On the Monastic Tract on the Don," "On the Gross of the Dnieper Scythia," and "Review of the Regalia of the Don Host." According to M. V. Pudavov, his father was not only familiar with the "Statistical Description of the Don" but was also one of its co-authors. Specifically, at the suggestion of the military ataman, Adjutant General M. G. Khomutov, "he compiled a brochure, 'A Brief Statistical View of the Land of the Don Host,' for the female students of the Don Mariinsky Institute." Thus, it can be confidently assumed that V. M. Pudavov was Sukhorukov's collaborator and was familiar with his works and all the collected materials. However, given that Pudavov only visited the capitals twice, and then briefly, one might doubt that he actually managed to work in the capital's archives, especially in Moscow, where he was passing through. Yet, it was precisely in Moscow that the most ancient sources on the history of the Cossacks were stored, which, as we recall, Sukhorukov had access to, which was one of the reasons for the latter's falling out with Chernyshev.

Ultimately, it was the speculative, "Karamzinian" view of the Cossacks that triumphed—the "runaway serf theory," which remained at the center of imperial historiography throughout the 19th century and continues to be periodically and

uncritically reproduced to this day. For Karamzin, the Cossacks were "thieves," brigands, and rebels who had illegally fled the autocracy but were then finally enlisted in the service of the tsar and the throne. The Cossack republics were illegitimate, as they were composed of fugitives, and their destruction and transformation into a service class seemed a logical outcome of the triumph of legality and autocratic power. Although, to be fair, it must be said that Karamzin, too, saw the ancient origins of the Cossacks in pre-Mongol Rus'. However, this once again emphasized the Slavic-Russian origins of the Cossacks and contrasted them with the "Batu hordes of Tatars." It is no coincidence that before Nicholas I the word Cossacks was written with a capital letter (Cossacks - that is, as a proper name, the name of a people, who then in Russia were written, as now in Europe, with a capital letter), and they were described as a unique people of the South of Russia.

Nikolaev's policy of strictly enforcing military order in the country led to the strict organization of the Cossacks as a service class. Sukhorukov and many other representatives of the Cossack intelligentsia and military elders suffered precisely because they were suspected of "Cossack autonomism" or "democratism." And "popularity" for a military commander in those years was considered unacceptable. After all, popular officers could become "new Decembrists."

Beginning with Nicholas I, all subsequent Russian tsars appointed nakaznik atamans exclusively from among "persons of the non-military class." This meant that Cossack atamans could not be natural-born Cossacks, and especially not popular representatives of the Cossack elders or even the so-called "military nobility." As a rule, the positions of military atamans and senior military commanders in the Cossack armies were filled by representatives of the Russian nobility, preferably not of Russian (East Slavic) origin, but of Baltic German descent, and so on.

Everything was done to eradicate the very idea of former Cossack liberties, "rebellion," and the military democracy of the early Cossack armies-republics. The regulation of Cossack life went so far that Cossacks were strictly forbidden to wear their traditional national (folk) dress and were required to wear the military uniform approved by Nicholas I, even at home. This order generally lasted until the 1905 revolution and even became a tradition, obediently maintained at the beginning of the 21st century by today's registered and "communal" Cossacks.

During the reign of Nicholas I, the official interpretation of Cossack history was presented in its most general and complete form in the voluminous work of Vladimir Bronevsky. His monograph on the Don Cossacks was published in the 1830s in three parts. The book was approved by P. Gaevsky at the Censorship Committee on June 21, 1833. This three-

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

volume work became one of the most famous and popular publications of the period, reflecting the official viewpoint on the origins, socio-ethnic nature, and history of the Cossacks in Russia. Emigrant Cossack authors directly accused Bronevsky of plagiarizing Sukhorukov, but it is more likely that he simply used available materials. However, this issue still requires closer examination.

Bronevsky portrays the origins of the Cossacks in complete accordance with the fugitive serf theory. This interpretation of the origins of the Cossacks would become the "general line" of the development of imperial historiography in Russia throughout the 19th century and would serve as the "censorship dogma" for all official historical literature until the Revolution of 1917. "In the deserted uluses of Batu's Horde, in uninhabited but fertile places where the trade route from Asia to Europe had long been, a new Republic arose; or, a community of people seeking wild freedom and plunder. This Republic, like the Roman Republic, was composed of freemen of various ranks who had come to the Don, from the Russian regions closest to the southern border."

Moreover, Bronevsky sees the main reason for the formation of this "free" people not in the peasants' flight from feudal exploitation and serfdom, which would become a characteristic feature of Soviet historiography. On the contrary, according to Bronevsky, it was precisely the peasants' freedom and the absence of serfdom that transformed the people into "lazy vagabonds" who, unwilling to work, gave rise to the Cossacks. In this interpretation, the Cossacks appear as vagabonds, slackers, fugitive criminals, and robbers. "This migration was greatly facilitated by the freedom of the peasants, who then annually migrated on St. George's Day (autumn) from landowner to landowner. This right gave birth to a large class of homeless people in Russia, accustomed to a nomadic life and fond of a lazy, unruly idleness that easily lured the common people into crime." Here, Bronevsky clearly and definitively expresses his position on the nobility and monarchy in favor of serfdom. He then supports his assertion with familiar quotations from Ivan the Terrible's letters to the Crimean Khan from 1520 and 1540. From this, the historian concludes, "Consequently, the beginning of the Don Cossacks' existence must be placed between these years." The logical "naivety" of such a syllogism can be illustrated by a similar assertion that since the first documents of the ambassadorial order concerning China date back to the 17th century, the beginning of that state's existence can therefore be placed in that century. The logically correct statement, however, would be "no later than this time."

Moreover, Bronevsky traces the etymology of the word "Cossack" and the origin of the name "Cossacks" to the Kasogs. This, it would seem, should indicate a much more ancient (than between 1520 and 1540) origin of the Cossacks. But this obvious

contradiction, which Karamzin understood, does not bother Bronevsky. "The name Kazakov comes from the Kasogs, a people who lived, according to our chronicles, between the Caspian and Black Seas. Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus calls this country Kazakhia; the Ossetians still call the Circassians Kosakhs. The word Kazak, among all the Asian tribes bordering Russia, means a free man and a lightly armed warrior serving on horseback. Thus, during civil strife, the Polovtsians, hired by the Russian princes, were called Cossacks (here Bronevsky refers to Vsevolodsky's "Historical Dictionary"); "Even today, the Kirghiz call themselves Kaisaks, and the Tatar tribe living 50 miles from Tiflis beyond the Saganlug ridge calls itself Kazakh. Cossacks generally served for pay; therefore, all hired men in Little Russia are still called Cossacks."

Further, turning to the phenomenological nature of the Cossacks, we can see how Bronevsky affirms their class-based service nature and functional role in the Russian state. According to Bronevsky, the Russian Cossacks were initially established by the Moscow tsars as a military service class modeled on the Tatar (Horde) Cossacks: "During the Tatar domination, the Baskaks maintained several hundred mounted Tatars on their payroll, who were also called Cossacks... Following their example, Cossacks were established in many Russian border towns. Initially used for dispatches, they later formed the first permanent army, always ready for service." According to Bronevsky, basing his argument on chronicle sources, the first Russian Cossacks appeared not on the Don (1520–1540), but in the Ryazan Principality (1444). "In the Ryazan region, most vulnerable to attacks by the Horde predators, we find the first Cossacks in Russia (1444); when, after the destruction of the appanages, the Autocratic Tsars began to raise permanent armies, there were also Cossacks under the names of Streletsky, Pushkarsky, who settled in special settlements near border towns, which still exist today, and are called by the name of the troops that lived there." And then follows a somewhat unexpected final conclusion: "The Don natives were called Cossacks, of course, for the reason that this title was already known to them in Russia, and also because all those serving in the Tsar's cavalry army were already called Cossacks." Regarding the ethnic affiliation of the first Cossacks, Bronevsky unequivocally and categorically asserts that they were Russians with an insignificant admixture of Greek, German and Polish surnames. Two of Bronevsky's arguments serve as evidence for this assertion, namely:

Firstly, Bronevsky proceeds from the premise that Orthodox Russians did not accept into their ranks the rebaptized Tatars, who had baptized Muslims. And the Muslims themselves, according to Bronevsky, were even more "firm in their faith." Therefore, they

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

would never have joined the Christian Cossacks, but would rather have joined the Horde Cossacks (Muslims) in Azov.

Secondly, Bronevsky examines the names, patronymics, and surnames of Cossacks from Russian documents known to him and concludes that the overwhelming majority of them are names from the Orthodox calendar. Therefore, Bronevsky concludes, since the names were Orthodox, their bearers were also Russians, or (in a negligible number) Greeks, Poles, and Germans. Thus, Bronevsky refutes "the opinions of G. Popov, Polevoy, and a few others, who boldly derive their Don Cossacks from Amazons, Sarmatians, Scythians, and other primitive inhabitants of the Don; as well as confirming the hints of other writers who accept or confuse the Azov Cossacks, with their Agus, Saryazmans, and other Mohammedan leaders, with our Don Cossacks." And finally, Bronevsky's final conclusion on the origin of the Cossacks: "The Azov, or so-called Horde Cossacks, consisted of a mixture of Mohammedan peoples living in the vicinity of the Don; and although they were called subjects of Ivan (from the preceding context, one can assume that Ivan IV the Terrible is meant, although this fits poorly with the subsequent statement) and served him, they were not Russian. The robberies of the Horde Cossacks are last mentioned in 1500, and in their place, in the desolate, deserted steppe, where these predators wandered for plunder for about 150 years, half a century later, new Cossacks appeared in history, called the Don Cossacks. These, being Russian and therefore subjects of Ivan, had our faith, our language, our appearance and our customs. Of these, the Lower Cossacks, who had long inhabited the outermost reaches of the Russian border, present a blend of Russian features with Asian traits in their appearance, solely because they obtained beautiful wives from Circassians and Turks; less charming, but more skilled, from Tatars; and others married ugly but more industrious Kalmyk women." This lengthy quotation clearly reveals all the logical and chronological inconsistencies characteristic of Vladimir Bronevsky's work. As we can see, on the question of the origins of the Cossacks, Bronevsky took a consistently pro-noble-serf position, which was quite characteristic of the official imperial historiography of the 18th and first half of the 19th centuries.

Official Orthodox autocratic historiography held a dominant position until the 1917 revolution. It generally reflected the government's view of Cossack history and was essentially limited by strict censorship. However, despite its sometimes biased nature, works of this school contain a wealth of factual material on Cossack history and culture. Among others, the fundamental works of V. A. Potto, F. A. Shcherbina, M. A. Karaulov, and A. I. Biryukov deserve special mention. A typical example is the official and extremely pompous history of the

Cossacks written by P. N. Krasnov, and "Pictures of the Bygone Quiet Don," a book published by order of the Military Ataman of the Don Cossack Host, Lieutenant General A. V. Samsonov. In general, the fundamental tenets of official imperial historiography correspond to the noble-monarchist tradition dating back to Karamzin and are guided by two principles: Orthodoxy and loyalty to the throne. From this perspective, the origins of the Cossacks are linked to fugitives, and the Don region becomes the center of Cossack formation. The Grebensky, Tersky, Yaitsky, and other Cossacks arrived in their traditional areas of residence from the Don region. The Caucasian War, for example, is presented as a series of military exploits by the Cossacks in an unequal struggle against predatory highlanders. The primary focus is on military service—the "sovereign"—and the "daring daring" Cossacks who performed it. The struggle against the predatory raids of the highlanders is presented as a continuation of the centuries-old struggle against the raids of the Tatars and other steppe dwellers, defending the borders of the Orthodox homeland—Holy Rus'—from Asian Muslims and nomads. The general development of zemstvo statistics, a characteristic feature of Russia after the reforms of the 1860s and 1870s, also affected the Cossack hosts. The organization of civil administration in the Cossack regions had its own distinct characteristics. The administration of the Cossack regions was headed by military boards, headed by atamans. The atamans had powers equivalent to those of a governor-general. The military boards were responsible for both military administration and civil affairs. The military boards were subordinate to the atamans of the departments, and in the line army, to the regimental boards. A department included several stanitsa societies, which enjoyed self-government rights. To exercise these rights, the stanitsa society elected a stanitsa board, headed by an elected stanitsa ataman. The stanitsa society enjoyed extensive rights and, in fact, respecting the traditions of the Cossack community, decided all matters of stanitsa life, in particular, granting permission to include new settlers as Cossacks, dividing property, adopting orphans, managing the stanitsa capital, etc. The study and statistical description of this entire military and stanitsa economy gave rise to a vast cluster of publications of various statistical materials on the Cossack troops and military regions. One of the aspects of the social, The Cossack periodical press was a key contributor to the literary, cultural, and, after the 1905 revolution, political life of the Cossack military regions. Its pages published Cossack memoirs, literary and scholarly contributions from the emerging Cossack intelligentsia, popular essays on military history, historiographic and bibliographical notes, and, occasionally, the results of scholarly research by local Cossack historians. Among the Cossack

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

publications of that period, the most notable was the capital's "Regional Review and Herald of the Cossack Host: A Weekly Socio-Political and Literary Newspaper," published in St. Petersburg since 1900. Supplements to this publication included various ethnographic, statistical, and historical studies by N. A. Borodin, I. D. Kuznetsov, P. P. Korolenko, statistical data on the Cossack hosts, and other similar publications. Even earlier, since 1881, the "Cossack Herald: A Socio-Political and Literary Newspaper" was published in Moscow, the capital. In addition to the central publications, Cossack newspapers were published in individual military regions. In the Don Host Region, in Novochoerkassk, the "Donskaya Gazeta" was published. In Kuban, the "Kuban Cossack Herald: A Weekly Military, Church, Social, and Literary Magazine" was published in Yekaterinodar. The "Leaflet of the Agricultural, Industrial, and Ethnographic Exhibition of the Kuban Cossack Host" was also published here in 1909–1910. Also published since 1865 was the "Kuban Regional News," which later, from March 1917, was published under the name "Svobodnaya Kuban: Organ of the Kuban Regional Executive Committee." The official newspaper of the Terek Cossack Host was the Terskie Vedomosti, published since 1868. A supplement to this newspaper included the "Collection of the Society of Lovers of Cossack Antiquities," as well as other thematic materials. In the Urals, the "Yaik Volya: Political, Social, and Literary Military Newspaper" was published in Uralsk under the Military Administration from 1868. In the Asian part of the country, the "Semirechenskaya Zhizn: Cossack Political, Social, and Literary Newspaper" was published in Verny from 1916. Almost all of these newspapers published a variety of thematic issues and supplements, published works by their Cossack authors in separate editions, and served as centers of attraction for the cultural life of the Cossack intelligentsia and officer corps. A weekly socio-political and literary newspaper" was published in St. Petersburg from 1900. The supplements to this publication contained various ethnographic, statistical and historical studies by N. A. Borodin, I. D. Kuznetsov, P. P. Korolenko, statistical data on the Cossack troops, and other similar publications. Even earlier, since 1881, "The Cossack Herald: A Socio-Political and Literary Newspaper" was published in the capital Moscow. In addition to the central publications, Cossack newspapers were published in individual military regions. In the Don Host Region, in Novochoerkassk, "The Donskaya Gazeta" was published. In Kuban, "The Kuban Cossack Herald: A Weekly Military, Church, Social and Literary Magazine" was published in Yekaterinodar. It was also published there in 1909–1910. "Leaflet of the Agricultural, Industrial, and Ethnographic Exhibition of the Kuban Cossack Host." Also published since 1865 was the newspaper "Kuban Regional News,"

which later, from March 1917, was renamed "Svobodnaya Kuban: Organ of the Kuban Regional Executive Committee." The official newspaper of the Terek Cossack Host was the "Terskie Vedomosti," published since 1868. A supplement to this newspaper included the "Collection of the Society of Lovers of Cossack Antiquities," as well as other thematic materials. In the Urals, "Yaik Volya: Political, Social, and Literary Military Newspaper" was published in Uralsk under the Military Administration since 1868. In the Asian part of the country, "Semirechenskaya Zhizn: Cossack Political, Social, and Literary Newspaper" was published in Verny since 1916. Almost all of these newspapers published a variety of thematic issues and supplements, published works by their Cossack authors in separate editions, and acted as unique centers of attraction for the cultural life of the Cossack intelligentsia and officers. A weekly socio-political and literary newspaper" was published in St. Petersburg from 1900. The supplements to this publication contained various ethnographic, statistical and historical studies by N. A. Borodin, I. D. Kuznetsov, P. P. Korolenko, statistical data on the Cossack troops, and other similar publications. Even earlier, since 1881, "The Cossack Herald: A Socio-Political and Literary Newspaper" was published in the capital Moscow. In addition to the central publications, Cossack newspapers were published in individual military regions. In the Don Host Region, in Novochoerkassk, "The Donskaya Gazeta" was published. In Kuban, "The Kuban Cossack Herald: A Weekly Military, Church, Social and Literary Magazine" was published in Yekaterinodar. It was also published there in 1909–1910. "Leaflet of the Agricultural, Industrial, and Ethnographic Exhibition of the Kuban Cossack Host." Also published since 1865 was the newspaper "Kuban Regional News," which later, from March 1917, was renamed "Svobodnaya Kuban: Organ of the Kuban Regional Executive Committee." The official newspaper of the Terek Cossack Host was the "Terskie Vedomosti," published since 1868. A supplement to this newspaper included the "Collection of the Society of Lovers of Cossack Antiquities," as well as other thematic materials. In the Urals, "Yaik Volya: Political, Social, and Literary Military Newspaper" was published in Uralsk under the Military Administration since 1868. In the Asian part of the country, "Semirechenskaya Zhizn: Cossack Political, Social, and Literary Newspaper" was published in Verny since 1916. Almost all of these newspapers published a variety of thematic issues and supplements, published works by their Cossack authors in separate editions, and acted as unique centers of attraction for the cultural life of the Cossack intelligentsia and officers. The official newspaper of the Terek Cossack Host was the Terskie Vedomosti, published since 1868. A supplement to this newspaper included the "Collection of the Society of Lovers of Cossack Antiquities," as well as other

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

thematic materials. In the Urals, the "Yaik Volya: Political, Social, and Literary Military Newspaper" was published in Uralsk under the Military Administration from 1868. In the Asian part of the country, the "Semirechenskaya Zhizn: Cossack Political, Social, and Literary Newspaper" was published in Verny from 1916. Almost all of these newspapers published a variety of thematic issues and supplements, published works by their Cossack authors in separate editions, and served as centers of attraction for the cultural life of the Cossack intelligentsia and officer corps. The official newspaper of the Terek Cossack Host was the Terskie Vedomosti, published since 1868. A supplement to this newspaper included the "Collection of the Society of Lovers of Cossack Antiquities," as well as other thematic materials. In the Urals, the "Yaik Volya: Political, Social, and Literary Military Newspaper" was published in Uralsk under the Military Administration from 1868. In the Asian part of the country, the "Semirechenskaya Zhizn: Cossack Political, Social, and Literary Newspaper" was published in Verny from 1916. Almost all of these newspapers published a variety of thematic issues and supplements, published works by their Cossack authors in separate editions, and served as centers of attraction for the cultural life of the Cossack intelligentsia and officer corps.

During the imperial period, particularly from the second half of the 19th century onward, numerous collections of documents and reference books on Cossack troops, as well as various military literature, were published. This was largely driven by military considerations and the corresponding government plans. At this time, the country's military leadership adopted a policy of unifying the entire cavalry based on the Cossack troops, and Cossack service was increasingly regularized. This meant that Cossacks were to form the bulk of the army's cavalry through regular service and appropriate statutory training. Until World War I, Cossacks remained the backbone of the Russian cavalry—the largest in the world. The military placed great hopes on the Cossacks in a future European war. Alexander III publicly threatened, in the event of German aggression, to literally "flood" all of East Prussia with Cossacks.

It's therefore unsurprising that Cossacks have featured prominently in the works of specialists in military theory, practice, and history. Furthermore, Cossack regions were the main historical centers of herd horse breeding and proper horse breeding. Accordingly, Cossack issues were invariably reflected in studies and publications devoted to domestic horse breeding. Moreover, these same Cossack regions were the main reservoir for horse mobilization in the event of large-scale military action and the need to mobilize a massive army. It's worth noting here that not only in the early 20th century but also during World War II, horses remained the primary draft animal in the army,

not only in the Soviet Union but also in the Wehrmacht. Examples of such literature include "Historical Essay on Russian Horse Breeding and Stud Farming" and other books by I.K. Merder, "Cavalry" by L.V. De-Witt, and a number of similar publications. Among military history literature, the seminal work "History of Cavalry" by Colonel Mikhail Illarionovich Markov, commander of the 1st Moscow Leibdragoon Regiment, deserves mention. In this work, Markov compiled various sources and summarized the military experience of cavalry in its historical development. Although from a professional historical perspective, Markov's work is a conscientious compilation, it is of undoubted interest not only for its military application but also as a typical illustration of the prevailing military views on the nature and history of the Cossacks. Recently, at the initiative of the Presidential Regiment, a republication of Markov's nine-volume work began. However, unfortunately, to our knowledge, only the first three volumes have been published to date. Regarding the emergence of the Cossacks, Markov writes that "furthermore, during the reign of Vasily Vasilyevich the Dark, a new force arose in southern Russia – the Cossacks." However, he further stipulates the possibility of an even earlier origin for the Cossacks, pointing out that they first appear in Russian sources under Vasily the Dark (though the fact that Cossacks were previously unknown to Russian chroniclers does not mean that the Cossacks themselves did not exist). Markov then classifies the Cossacks as mercenaries drawn from the natural steppe cavalry: "Finally, the princes often resorted to mercenary troops: Lithuanian, Dnieper Brodniki, and even Mongolian. It was during the reign of Vasily the Dark that the name of Cossacks, whether Ryazan or Don, is first mentioned; they participated alongside the Moscow militia in the battle against the Tatar Khan Mustafa in 1444. But many believe that these free light-horse troops existed much earlier under the name Brodniki, or Brovniki, similar to the Lithuanian Brovniki and the Cossacks of Little Russia and the Czech Republic." And further Markov refers to the scarcity of sources about the early period of the history of the Cossacks: "Since we have only fragmentary information about the actions of the Cossacks in the period described, then here (i.e. in book 1, "The Department of Ancient and Middle History of Cavalry," "We will not talk about it (before the invention of firearms").

It's curious to note how Markov, who drew extensively on primarily European sources, provides interesting information about the names of certain elements of the French uniform. In describing the uniform of the first regular cavalry units formed in 1445 by the French King Charles VII, Markov states that from the time of Charles VI, "The gendarmes of the ordinance companies, like the other men of these companies, had two uniforms: a ceremonial uniform, also a combat uniform, consisting of a hoqueton,

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

uniformed throughout the company, and a cosaque, a traveling cloak with wide sleeves." And further on, regarding the reviews of these royal companies: "At reviews of the second category, men were required to appear in half-caftans (cosaque de livree), unarmed, and dealt with military commissars." Later, Markov, describing the clothing of French cavalymen, simply calls the costume – in Russian – "kazakin" (as the traditional clothing of the 19th century Cossacks, in the form of a long frock coat, was called).

These, in fact, are the few lines Markov devotes to the question of the origins of the Cossacks in his fundamental work. This is far less than the same author devoted, for example, to the origins of European chivalry, dragoons, or the Arabka light cavalry. Again, from a historical methodology standpoint, Markov is a conscientious compiler who brings together all known sources on his chosen subject. Therefore, his work very well illustrates the general level of development of military history at that time in this area. Thus, one can see that even the most extensive general works on the history of cavalry, the origins, culture, and history of the Cossacks were not given any close or serious attention. The military was interested only in the military history of the Cossacks, their participation in wars, and the combat experience of Cossack troops.

As for specialized "Cossack" military literature, it was produced primarily by the military department. The Main Directorate of Cossack Troops (GUKV) occupied the leading position among the central state and military institutions for the management of Cossack troops. It collected and analyzed reports on all Cossack troops and Cossack military regions of the empire, developed and coordinated national legislative acts and administrative orders, departmental instructions, and regulations concerning both military and other state service of the Cossacks, as well as the administrative local civil administration and self-government of Cossack military regions. The GUKV also studied the history of the Cossacks and Cossack service, studied and systematized the combat records of individual Cossack regiments and troops, and was in charge of troop and regimental awards and distinctions, among other things.

The Directorate of Irregular Troops, which oversaw the Cossack and irregular troops, was established on December 16, 1857. On March 29, 1867, the directorate was renamed the Main Directorate of Irregular Troops, and on October 27, 1879, it was transformed into the Main Directorate of Cossack Troops. The GUKV was liquidated on September 6, 1910, and its functions were transferred to the Cossack Department of the General Staff. The GUKV archival collection contains a wide variety of data. These are, of course, annual reports and statements on the state of the Cossack troops for the period 1874–1916. These include the annual reports of the Main Directorate of Irregular Troops for 1871–

1878, the annual reports of the Main Directorate of the Irregular Troops for the period from 1879 to 1909, and the report of the Cossack Department of the General Staff for 1910. But, in addition, the Main Directorate of the Irregular Troops accumulated statistical reports and correspondence on the size, movement, and composition of the population of the Cossack regions. On the relationship between the native Cossack and the newcomer ("out-of-town") population. Correspondence on the organization and activities of the civil administration and local Cossack self-government. Materials on land ownership, land use, and land management of the Cossack and "out-of-town" population. Information on the resettlement of Cossacks from land-poor areas. Here we also find extensive information on the agriculture of the Cossack regions—on grain farming, fruit growing, horticulture, and the cultivation of industrial crops and tobacco. It also contains information on livestock and horse breeding. Information on land reclamation, forestry, and the like is also included. It also contains laws and information on the fisheries industry, which played a major role in the Cossack economy. Documents on the location and extraction of minerals and on military industry are also included. Materials on the organization of public education and military training are also included. The Main Directorate of the Cossack Archives also preserved documents on the history of the Cossacks, collected for the preparation of works on the history of the Cossacks in the Russian Empire. Thus, the central military command was interested in virtually all aspects of the life and history of the Cossack troops. Furthermore, the military department produced a wealth of specialized military literature to organize the ongoing administrative and military management of the Cossack troops, organize training and preparation, and analyze and summarize accumulated military experience.

Therefore, it is clear that in the imperial period, after the final and solid integration of the Cossacks into the structure of the state armed forces under Nicholas I, much attention was paid to the publication of all military and official literature on the Cossacks. These include textbooks and military regulations. As an example, we can cite various collections of orders of the military department for all Cossack and irregular troops. Then we can cite collections of orders and other official documents for individual Cossack troops.

Another area of publications of that time is various reports and reports on various Cossack troops. As a rule, these were annual reports of the chiefs (nakazny atamans) of the corresponding military regions. The atamans' reports included a secret part, which was sent to the military department, was not published, but ended up in the archive. As an example, we can cite the "Most humble report of the chief of the Terek region and the nakazny ataman of the TKV on the state of the region and the army for 1891", etc. or

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИЦ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

"On the state of the Kuban region and the Kuban Cossack army for 1893", etc. Unlike the military part, a report of the same ataman could be published, but already as a civilian chief of the corresponding Cossack military region. These reports contain a wide variety of information on all aspects of the life and activities of the Cossack, "out-of-town" and "foreign" population of the Cossack army regions. It was from these reports that the GUKV extracted all the information and statistical data it needed about the internal situation of the Cossack troops (see the description of the GUKV collection above). In general, such reports, along with military statistics, became the most important historical source for studying the economy and social development of the Cossack troops.

Many books were published on the military history of individual Cossack troops, regiments, and other institutions. At the turn of the century, the compilation of so-called regimental histories by proactive officers commissioned by command was particularly popular. They were considered an important means of patriotic and military education for officers and enlisted men. This process naturally also affected Cossack regiments, which, as we recall, were increasingly acquiring the characteristics of regular formations during these years. This included permanent numbers, honorary colonels, seniority, and other attributes of regular regiments with their cult of regimental history. Particularly from the 1880s and 1890s, numerous publications were dedicated to various anniversaries in regimental and troop histories. In 1912, the centenary of the Patriotic War was widely celebrated, and in connection with this, many publications were published about the Cossack heroes of 1812—Platov, Orlov-Denisov, and others. In 1913, the entire country, and of course the army, celebrated the 300th anniversary of the Romanov dynasty. Cossacks had played a crucial role in the election of Mikhail Feodorovich Romanov to the throne in 1613. Therefore, the Cossacks had a direct connection to the Romanov anniversary. Under these circumstances, anniversaries commemorating the centuries-long faithful service of a particular Cossack army to the throne took on particular relevance. During this period, special commemorative insignia for the Cossacks were issued, and, of course, various publications on the subject followed.

Another topic for numerous publications was a variety of summaries and military analyses of Cossack actions in the numerous wars waged by the Russian Empire at the time. Here, we see two types of publications: either an analysis of tactical actions from the perspective of military theory and practice, or a simple recording of the historical and combat experience of individual Cossack regiments and units. These included descriptions of the participation in military actions by both individuals—usually memoirists—and entire regiments and troops. One of

the first such publications was a description of the glorious victories of the legendary Ataman Platov. The outbreak of World War I gave rise to numerous publications of a propaganda nature, describing the glorious victories and exploits of "our brave Cossacks" on the battlefield.

The memoirs of the 19th century stand apart from other imperial military literature. The Cossacks left a bright mark on the memoirs of the Napoleonic Wars. Here we can recall the notes of the legendary hero-partisan of 1812 and gifted writer Denis Vasilyevich Davydov. In his works, Davydov vividly illuminated the participation of the Cossacks in the war and, especially, his joint partisan actions with the Cossacks. It was the Cossacks who proved themselves masters of partisan (small) warfare in 1812. This was noted in their memoirs by all French officers. A classic example is the aforementioned memoirs of Armand de Caulaincourt and General Morand. Davydov himself learned many things from the Cossacks. His "Diary of Partisan Actions of 1812" serves as an excellent source for studying Cossack tactics. It is no coincidence that Davydov himself, at the beginning of his partisan career, asked for a thousand Cossacks to ensure the success of the enterprise, but received only one hundred and fifty, and in addition fifty hussars.

This is what Davydov wrote about this incident in his diary: "His Serene Highness has agreed to send one party to the rear of the French army as a trial, but, considering the success of the undertaking doubtful, he appoints only fifty hussars and one hundred and fifty Cossacks; he wants you to undertake this matter yourself." I answered him: "I would be ashamed, Prince, to propose a dangerous undertaking and cede the execution of this undertaking to another. You yourself know that I am ready for anything; what is needed is benefit – that is the main thing, but for benefit – there are few people!" – "He will not give more!" – "If so, then I am going with this number; perhaps I will open the way for larger detachments!" "I expected as much from you," said the prince, "but between ourselves, what is Your Serene Highness so afraid of? Is it worthwhile to bargain over a few hundred men when the issue is that, in case of success, he can ruin the enemy's establishments and supplies, which are so vital to him, and in case of failure he will lose a handful of people? What is to be done! War is not for kissing." "Believe me, Prince," I answered him, "I vouch on my honor that the party will be safe; for this, in addition to courage in raids, decisiveness in difficult situations and vigilance at halts and overnight stays are needed; I undertake this... only, I repeat, the men are few; give me a thousand Cossacks, and you will see what will happen." – "I would have given you three thousand the first time, for I don't like to do things gropingly, but there's nothing to say about that; the field marshal himself appointed the strength of the party; we must obey." Later, Davydov, as a

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

professional military man, a general, wrote a special military-scientific study, "On Guerrilla Warfare." In this work, he summarized the experience of the Cossacks' guerrilla actions in 1812 and made the following conclusions: "After the Battle of Borodino, it was time to test this new use of light cavalry. A certain number of Cossack detachments were sent along the enemy army's communication routes: and as soon as they separated from our main forces, the enemy's hitherto serene communication routes took on a different appearance; everything turned upside down and into chaos, and an innumerable number of soldiers and officials of all ranks, supplies and weapons, stores with charges and even guns cluttered up our headquarters. It is safe to say that more than a third of the army, captured from the enemy, and all the transports heading for him and which fell into our hands at this decisive turning point in Russia's fate, belong to those Cossack detachments which operated in the rear and on the flanks of the enemy army. If the outcome of a single trial of this—for given the small number of parties then sent along the enemy's communication route, this enterprise can be considered a true trial—if this outcome, I say, presents us with such an enormous gain with the use of such weak means, then what cannot be expected from the development of this type of operation on a scale commensurate with the large number of our light cavalry in offensive wars with Europe? This is how the celebrated partisan hero of 1812 assessed the high effectiveness of Cossack partisan actions. With a small number of men, with little bloodshed, Results of strategic significance were achieved. Davydov, as we see, highly valued the contribution of the Cossack partisans to the defeat of the enemy. Despite their small numbers, they destroyed, according to Davydov, up to a third of Napoleon's entire Grande Armée.

Another important topic for Russian military memoirs in the 19th century was the Caucasus. The Great Caucasian War raged here for almost the entire nineteenth century. For these reasons, the Caucasian War became one of the most famous events covered in contemporary military memoirs. It is particularly significant that here, in the Caucasus, Cossacks played a leading role in the daily operations of the war. It was here that officer memoirists were able to become intimately acquainted with the daily life of Cossack villages amidst the constant warfare of raids.

It's important to note that the Caucasian Army was distinguished by the extremely broad autonomy of local commanders, particularly the "Caucasian" officers, who were prone to bold initiative. The Caucasian Corps was also distinguished by a unique, almost familial, atmosphere in relationships between comrades. This applied equally to both "Caucasian officers" and the lower ranks. These traits can also be seen in the relationships between commanders and enlisted men. The widespread custom of *kunachestvo*

between companies of different regiments was very characteristic of the Caucasian troops. Even under the conditions of "Nikolai's Russia," relationships in the Caucasian Corps were distinguished by a particular freedom. A. M. Dondukov-Korsakov recounts a telling episode in his memoirs to characterize the "old Caucasian" Count Steinbock-Fermor, who commanded the Grebensky Regiment in 1839: "...having quarreled (after dinner) over some trivial matters with Pullo, the commander of the Kurinsky Regiment, then stationed in Grozny, Steinbock alerted his entire regiment with artillery and crossed the Terek, threatening Pullo, who, for his part, took measures to defend Grozny." Then, according to the memoirist, "...fortunately, the whole matter was settled by mediators..." Commenting on this episode, unthinkable by St. Petersburg standards, Dondukov-Korsakov explains that "...all this seemed so natural that it didn't surprise anyone and was considered a family matter..." And finally, only in the Caucasian Corps was it possible for colonels and even captains to pursue a "nearly personal" foreign policy, even concluding peace treaties with individual mountain communities. All this created a unique spiritual atmosphere and inspired authors to write memoirs, works of fiction, and the like.

Memoirs of the Great Caucasian War were widely published in the late 19th century. Much attention was devoted to collecting the recollections of direct participants of the Caucasian War after its conclusion. Memoirs were published in a number of publications, particularly actively in the 1860s–1880s. For obvious reasons, the memoirists (most often retired officers of the Caucasian Corps) focused primarily on military operations, leaving space for coverage of civilian life and the peculiarities of "Caucasian" everyday life only to the extent that this life directly affected the author of the narrative. It goes without saying that Russian officers, among whom were many Europeans and foreigners in Russian service, mentioned in their memoirs and notes those facts and customs that seemed particularly unusual to them, i.e., deviating from standard Russian and European practice. The social status of the author of the memoirs also played an important role; most often, he or she was a fairly educated and wealthy nobleman, an aristocrat seeking fame and romance in the Caucasus Mountains, or sometimes even an outright adventurer.

It should also be noted that it was common for officers assigned to a single campaign from the Guards regiments to participate in summer expeditions. For them, the Caucasian War was, as a rule, merely a romantic episode and a quick way to earn a cross for their buttonhole. Therefore, the memoirist mostly saw only the superficial side of the events he described. These typically involved summer expeditions to the mountains as part of detachments, followed by rest or treatment at the Caucasian Mineral

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.191
ESJI (KZ) = 8.100
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Waters, surrounded by aristocratic "water society." What was happening at the grassroots level, and particularly in Cossack and mountaineer life, remained hidden from him. Thus, despite the fact that almost all memoirists' "acquaintance with the Caucasus" began in the villages of the Lineytsy—the Caucasian Line Cossack Host—their memoirs focus solely on describing the beautiful Cossack women of the Chervlenaya village.

The true servicemen—the "Caucasians," who formed the core of the junior officers and non-commissioned officers of the Caucasian Corps—usually had neither the time, nor the means, nor the education to write memoirs, and their experiences were passed on primarily orally. It should be noted, however, that this experience was to some extent reflected in the memoirs of the nobility, either in the form of retellings or, more often, entertaining anecdotes. At the same time, these distinguished memoirists treated the rank-and-file "Caucasian" officers with condescension and even disdain. An example of this can be seen in the works of M. Yu. Lermontov—both in the well-known character of Maxim Maximovich from "A Hero of Our Time" and in the far more caustic essay "Caucasian." At the same time, the memoirs of staff officers are of great interest. On the one hand, they were familiar with the ideas of the command and the general situation, and on the other, due to the nature of their service, they delved into many of the region's peculiarities – geographical, climatic, ethnographic, etc. Among such memoirs, the "Memoirs" of G. I. Filipson deserves special mention. Grigory Ivanovich Filipson (1809–1883) – General of Infantry (from 1880), Senator (from 1861), graduated from the Nikolaev Academy of the General Staff. In 1835, at his own request, he was sent to the Caucasus with the rank of captain, where he served under the commander of the troops on the Caucasus Line and in the Black Sea region, the famous A. A. Velyaminov. Filipson was engaged in cartographic surveys of the area for the General Staff, served as Oberberquartiermeister of the troops of the Caucasus Line, and later served as Chief of Staff of the Black Sea Coastal Line under Nikolai Nikolaevich Raevsky (Jr.). From 1845, with the rank of major general, Filipson served as chief of staff for the entire Caucasus line. He retired five years later. However, in 1855, Filipson was appointed acting ataman of the Black Sea Cossack Host. He completed his service as chief of staff of the entire Caucasus Army in 1860. After retiring, he wrote memoirs, which were first published in the Russian Archives in 1884–1885. Filipson was well educated and no stranger to state policy. Having served a total of twenty years in the Caucasus, the memoirist had acquired an intimate knowledge of the region, its customs, and its peculiarities. Due to his service as a staff officer, he was familiar with both specific events and the overall picture of military operations during the Caucasian

War. Being directly subordinate to prominent Caucasian military leaders, Philipson was able to form a very accurate understanding of the overall strategy of the Russian command in the region.

The theme of captivity occupies a special place in "Caucasian" memoirs. For the mountain societies of the North Caucasus, kidnapping was a traditional element of the raiding system, characteristic of tribes at a stage of development corresponding to military democracy, in the context of a low-productivity mountain economy that did not fully ensure regular social reproduction. In the pre-state (barbarian) period of social development, kidnapping served as a crucial means of maintaining genetic diversity. Given the polyethnicity and extreme fragmentation of ethnic groups in the mountainous and isolated terrain of the Caucasus Range, this was particularly pronounced and was embodied in the persistent marriage customs of "bride kidnapping."

The kidnappers' primary goals were, firstly, to enslave the captives (usually adult men) and subsequently incorporate them into the clan as dependent peasants. As Islam spread among the highlanders, the primary means of Islamizing captives and incorporating them into the local community became marriage to local girls. Secondly, they were sold to more remote mountainous regions or, more often, resold (usually children and young women) to the Islamic countries of the East – Turkey and Persia. As the Great Caucasian War progressed, a third motive emerged: kidnapping for ransom. It is important to note that while ordinary citizens, soldiers, and generally broad sections of the population, both highlanders and Russian subjects, were subjected to kidnapping for ransom, the primary "target" of kidnapping for ransom was primarily noblemen – officers and, to some extent, officials.

The kidnapping of a Russian officer was particularly attractive to the highlanders—the captors could count not only on receiving a ransom from wealthy relatives or the government, but also on exchanging captives for hostages and the like. This was the case, for example, with Lieutenant Colonel Kobiyev, who was exchanged for a highlander from the village of Chirkat who had been held captive for about 20 years, as reported in the diary of an anonymous officer with the initials "P.K." from the 82nd Dagestan Regiment. Capturing an officer was extremely honorable among the highlanders, and the captor could count on expanding his influence and increasing his standing among his fellow tribesmen. For this reason, with the onset of the ghazawat and the emergence of Shamil's Imamate, the propaganda value of such kidnappings also became important.

Captivity, especially during the Caucasian War, was quite widespread and, moreover, acquired certain characteristics of a specific social institution within the raiding system. Below, we will examine how the institution of captivity functioned within the Greater

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

Caucasian War, where it played a significant role in the ethnogenesis of the North Caucasian Cossacks, as well as in cultural and intercivilizational exchange. The phenomenon of Caucasian captive memoirs is presented primarily in the memoirs of officers of the Caucasian Corps.

Although officers were captured by the highlanders far less frequently than rank-and-file soldiers and especially Cossacks (primarily Cossack villagers, including teenagers, women, and others), such cases generated significant public resonance and, as a result, received considerable publicity. This is precisely why such cases were more fully explored in memoirs, particularly in the recollections of the former captives themselves, who were encouraged by an intrigued public to share their "stories." Even when a captive's "story" was only shared orally, at least within the circle of "water society," it could be written down and passed on by listeners, lovers of Caucasian exotica.

The memoirs of a Russian officer who was captured are particularly valuable due to the author's high level of education and general knowledge. However, it must be taken into account that the latter viewed the world of the highlanders through the eyes of a professional soldier, not an ethnographer, and many everyday and cultural peculiarities may have escaped the author's attention. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of officers were noble by origin and, consequently, had a corresponding upbringing, mentality, and stereotyped thinking, making it difficult for them to understand the lives of not only the "wild mountaineers," but also the Russian Cossacks, and, at times, even their own peasants. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the officer viewed the highlander as an adversary, while the highlander, in turn, saw the Russian officer as the living embodiment of his worst enemy—the Russian Empire.

Of significant interest in the context of the Cossack issue under consideration are those episodes in the memoirs that touch on the specifics of the relationship between highlanders and Cossacks, including those held in captivity. It's impossible not to notice that the captured Cossacks appear more attuned to the situation than the authors of the memoirs themselves. It is precisely the "captive" memoirs that allow us to trace, to a certain extent, the relationship between Cossacks and highlanders, so to speak, from within the mountain village, across the "line"—in the territory of free highland communities.

The most striking, classic example of "captive" memoir writing was "Memoirs of a Caucasian Officer" by F. F. Tornau (1810–1890), first published in "Russky Vestnik" in 1864. Fyodor Fyodorovich Tornau ("Tornauw"—in his own spelling, "Tornov") was a baron, lieutenant general, member of the Military Scientific Committee of the General Staff, senator, and memoirist. In 1832, he secured a transfer

from the General Staff in St. Petersburg to the Caucasus, where he was appointed head of the second section of the General Staff chancery in Tiflis. He participated in expeditions in the mountains of Chechnya and was wounded in a battle with the highlanders. In 1835, he carried out two successful secret reconnaissance expeditions into the mountains to reconnoiter the area. The following year, as a captain on the General Staff, Tornau, on assignment from General G.Kh. Zass, set out on a third "secret review" and was betrayed by his guides to the highlanders, where he spent more than two years (September 1836 – November 1838) in captivity. The story of Tornau's capture received widespread publicity, and even 26 years later, when "Memoirs of a Caucasian Officer" were first published in the "Russian Messenger," they generated considerable interest.

Tornau's memoirs are particularly valuable. The author was not only a brilliantly educated General Staff officer, but also possessed a clear analytical mind and keen observation, was deeply informed about developments in the Caucasus, and, finally, possessed literary talent. Written after a considerable period of time, the "Memoirs" are distinguished by their retrospective perspective. This, on the one hand, allowed the author to make broad generalizations of a military-strategic and political nature, but, on the other, undoubtedly affected the accuracy of certain details and episodes. The Decembrists also left a significant imprint among memoir sources; at their request, Nicholas I permitted them to replace their hard labor in Siberia with military service as privates in the Caucasian Corps. These memoirs include A. E. Rosen, N. I. Lorer, A. P. Belyaev, and others. It is important to note the significant peculiarity of the memoirs of the Decembrists who served in the Caucasus. Unlike other officers demoted, for example, for duels or official misconduct, former Decembrists had virtually no hope of pardon through a petition addressed to the Emperor by high-ranking relatives, nor of reinstatement of their officer rank for distinguished service, nor even for personal distinction—a heroic act. Because of this, the recollections of former Decembrists about their service in the Caucasus are particularly interesting as testimonies from individuals who witnessed the Caucasian War and its everyday aspects through the eyes of ordinary participants. Moreover, the Decembrists represented the cream of aristocratic society in the first quarter of the 19th century, and many were distinguished by an excellent education and high culture. It is sufficient to recall the Decembrist Odoevsky, who ended his days in the Caucasus. It is also important to remember that the Decembrists were, on the one hand, under close surveillance, and on the other, enjoyed certain concessions and, at times, sympathy from their superiors, and were, therefore, not truly ordinary

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

soldiers of the Caucasian Corps. However, in the absence of testimony from ordinary soldiers and Cossacks, the memoirs of the Decembrists are very important, as they sometimes depict everyday details from the lives of ordinary soldiers, although, we emphasize, they are by no means entirely identical.

A typical Decembrist memoir is "Memoirs of a Decembrist of His Experiences and Feelings" by A.P. Belyaev. Alexander Petrovich Belyaev served as a midshipman in the Naval Guards Crew and undertook several long-distance voyages. Although not formally a member of the secret society, he shared the views of the Decembrists and took part in the uprising on Senate Square on December 14. He was sentenced to twelve years of hard labor, but in 1839 he was transferred to the Caucasus as a private in the active army, where he served until 1846.

Belyaev's memoirs provide interesting information about the life and daily life of the Cossacks and the peculiarities of their everyday and military interactions with the highlanders, and are valuable in those places where they are written from the words of ordinary Cossacks themselves, with whom the memoirist, due to his service and position, had the opportunity to communicate personally - during marches, expeditions, in villages. Thus, for example, Belyaev relates an interesting incident about the relations between Cossacks and Circassians. When Belyaev encountered Circassians on a march, the Cossack walking next to him, "recognizing them as Circassians, but not knowing whether they were peaceful or predators, suddenly turned away from the road, which at first might have seemed to us like flight; but, having made a semicircle, he returned to the road. Following this maneuver, we saw that one horseman from that party also separated and, having made a similar semicircle, returned; "Only then did our Cossack explain to us that this was a prearranged signal between our troops and the peaceful Circassians; if the signal was not repeated from the other side, then we had to prepare for battle or take to our heels, when our forces were disproportionate." At the same time, Belyaev himself notes that "... our battalion commanders often visited us, who treated us in the most friendly manner and never made us feel our soldierly rank. At bivouacs, as Belyaev writes, the former Decembrists tried to keep aloof from the soldiers and in everyday life more often conversed with the officers, to which the authorities turned a blind eye, especially during expeditions and campaigns.

The diaries of officers who participated in the Caucasian War closely resemble memoirs in their characteristic features. These diaries reflected the current state of affairs and the author's vivid attitude toward the events to which they were direct witnesses. At the same time, it should be noted that many memoirs were also based on diary entries. A significant feature of these diaries is their detailed,

often intricate, descriptions of the lives and daily routines of both the Separate Caucasian Corps and, of particular interest to us who participated in military operations, the Don and Caucasian Cossacks. In this regard, it is important to note the significant significance of the testimony of officers who were only temporarily assigned to troops operating in the Caucasus. It should be noted that the memoirist, often writing his memoirs after several, or even many, years have passed since the events described, primarily focuses on personal impressions and experiences, on the one hand, and, while employing a retrospective perspective in describing "Caucasian" life and the daily routine of the Caucasian War, on the other hand, he is inclined to more or less broad generalizations and conclusions, especially since many of the everyday peculiarities of Caucasian life become routine for him over the years of service, something to which the memoirist, in general, rarely pays attention. At the height of the Caucasian War from 1835 to 1845, by order of Emperor Nicholas I, one officer from each Guards regiment was sent annually to serve in expeditions of the active Caucasian Corps. These seconded Guards officers provoked open irony among the officers of the Caucasian Corps. For example, Melentiy Yakovlevich Olshevsky, who served in the Caucasus for 25 years, wrote in his "notes" about the guards officers assigned to him: "Stavropol was filled for several months with young soldiers from the best and wealthiest families, arriving from St. Petersburg." Despite the well-known disdain shown by veteran Caucasian officers for the guardsmen, who "had never smelled gunpowder" and had come on a single expedition "for orders and rank," their testimony is interesting precisely because of their lack of expertise in Caucasian affairs. For the assigned guardsmen, everything in the Caucasus was new, everything unusual and colorful, so they paid attention to various everyday details of Caucasian life that "true Caucasians" considered completely ordinary and not worth mentioning.

Among the aristocratic youth were also outstanding individuals, possessing a brilliant education and profound intellect, who later played a prominent role both in Russian history and in Caucasian affairs. One such example was Dmitry Alekseevich Milutin, who was sent to the Caucasus in 1839–1840. He later became a field marshal, professor, and military historian. Under Prince Baryatinsky, he served as Chief of Staff of the Caucasian Army, and later served as Minister of War during the liberal reforms of Alexander II.

Another characteristic of diary entries should be noted: since they were originally written for personal use and not intended for publication or general publicity, they were intimate in nature, allowing their authors to avoid concerns about censorship, career, or social restrictions. This gave the diaries a significantly greater objectivity in their coverage of certain facts

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИЦ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

that were perhaps unflattering to the official point of view. One striking example of a diary entry is the diary of Nikolai Vasilyevich Simonovsky, a lieutenant in the Life Guards Uhlan Regiment, covering the years 1837–1838 and detailing the summer expedition of 1837. Of particular interest to our research is the diary's description of the Cossack cordon line, its structure and daily life, as well as a detailed (day-by-day) account of the Caucasian Corps' tactics during this period.

Among the entire body of memoir literature, the memoirs of the first memoirist from among the native Cossacks deserve special consideration: Andriyan Karpovich Denisov, whom we already mentioned above in the context of the "Sukhorukov" story. A.K. Denisov was born in the village of Pyatizbyanskaya in 1763. From 1775, he studied in St. Petersburg. He entered the service as a simple Cossack at the age of 13, and by 1777 had attained the rank of esaul. He fought under the command of the great A.V. Suvorov. During the storming of Izmail, he was the first to scale the bastion, for which he received the Order of St. George, 4th Class. He distinguished himself brilliantly in the war against the Polish Confederates. He distinguished himself again in Suvorov's Italian campaign and was promoted to major general for the Battle of Novi. He took an active part in the Napoleonic Wars. In 1812, Platov left him on the Don as a deputy ataman to form a general Cossack militia. For his excellent management in this matter, he received the rank of lieutenant general in 1813.

After Platov's death in 1818, A.K. Denisov became the new Host Ataman. In this position, he attempted to implement reforms in the Don region and initiated the development of the first official written law of the Don region, the "Regulations on the Don Host." The ataman likely intended this regulation to serve as a kind of Don constitution, in keeping with the general constitutional sentiments of Alexander I's reign. As A.P. Chebotarev, the first publisher and commentator of Denisov's memoirs, wrote: "Denisov resolved on a noble feat—to sacrifice his autocracy for the common good and to give the host administration a new organization, in line with the demands of the times." Denisov asked the Tsar to appoint him head of the commission to develop the Regulations. However, Alexander I, having approved the very idea of creating the commission, appointed as its chairman the well-known A.I. Chernyshev, an executive but distant from Cossack life and customs. Thus, as we recall from the "Sukhorukov" story, Alexander I, like Nicholas I later, did not trust the Cossacks to organize their own lives. This situation inevitably led to conflicts within the commission. At the same time, Ataman Denisov, himself descended from the Don elders, attempted to give his reforms a democratic character.

In particular, Denisov envisioned restoring the Cossacks' former equality in land use and fishing, and ensuring equal distribution of yurt land. Since ancient

times, the Cossacks had enjoyed the "right of occupation" (similar to the ancient Romans): if there was surplus yurt land, any Cossack could freely occupy it for grazing cattle, horses, or establishing his own farmstead or winter camp. However, as the Don nobility developed (with the active support of the Moscow tsars) and commodity production spread (as Denisov himself wrote, "for enrichment," not for the self-sufficiency of ordinary Cossacks), a significant portion of the yurt lands ended up in the possession of Don landowners, who acquired Russian serfs to cultivate the "excess" land. Denisov sought to redistribute the land and ensure equal access to the river for all Cossacks.

Furthermore, the ataman wanted to redistribute the financial burden of maintaining the military capital so that the wealthy (i.e., landowners) would pay more and ordinary Cossacks less. He chose to implement this through the introduction of wine tax farms throughout the entire military territory. These tax farms contributed to the military treasury, but they infringed on the interests of the Don landowners, who, according to the Charter of the Nobility, enjoyed the right to freely distill alcohol. In essence, this measure was tantamount to the introduction of indirect taxation within the military.

During his administrative reforms, Denisov made every effort to curb the "extortion" of the nascent service bureaucracy in the Don within the Host Administration. In the old days, when all military and stanitsa positions were elected, this problem had not existed. But with the final subordination of the Don Host to the autocratic state, a service bureaucracy inevitably began to emerge in the Don, dependent not on the Cossack circle, but on the "authorities" in St. Petersburg. It became the main vehicle of autocratic power and, simultaneously, the main source of corruption, an inescapable evil in any bureaucratic structure. Throughout this reform effort, Denisov encountered, on the one hand, the discontent of the Don nobility and bureaucracy, and, on the other, the wrath of the all-powerful A.I. Chernyshev, with whom he constantly argued over the draft regulations. The latter reported this matter to the Tsar in such a light that Alexander I personally dismissed the disobedient ataman from his post in 1821. Moreover, a court case was opened against Denisov, and although the accusations of extortion were not proven, he was kept under strict surveillance (effectively under house arrest) for the rest of his life, and the case was never closed until the death of the disgraced ataman in 1841. However, all of Denisov's reformist plans and motives were reflected in his memoirs, which he wrote during his years of disgrace.

A.K. Denisov came from an ancient and highly respected family of Don Cossack elders and was a great patriot of the Don region. His father was Major General Karp Petrovich Denisov, brother of the famous Catherine the Great general, the first Cossack

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

count, Fyodor Petrovich Denisov, one of the founders of the most illustrious family of the Don nobility – the Orlov-Denisovs. The Denisov family descended from their ancestor, Denis-Batyr, and A.K. Denisov, in his memoirs, calls the Denisovs the most ancient Don family. This family preserved ancient traditions and legends, a living memory of the Don's former independence and the ancient Cossack military democracy. From an early age, Denisov showed an interest in the history of the Don Cossacks. He collected ancient traditions and legends about the origins of the Don Cossacks. Denisov devoted the last years of his life to writing his memoirs, where he addressed not only his family history and past battles, as is typical in memoirs. He sought to express his perspective on the history of the Don Host and the necessary reforms. He also sought to defend his Cossack perspective on the reforms being carried out within the Host.

In his memoirs, Denisov outlined his version of the origins of the Cossacks and their ancient history. He prefaces his memoirs with a general discussion of the origins of the Don Cossacks. He writes that as early as 1781 he collected "verbal traditions" from old-timer Cossacks. According to this version, the first Don Cossacks came to the Don from the Terek (and not the other way around, as is commonly believed in the conventional history of the Cossacks). These Caucasian newcomers settled downriver from the Golubinskaya or Pyatizbyanskaya stanitsas. In appearance, they were not "Tatars," but rather European-like, "consistent with the Great Russians," and professed the Christian faith. They earned their living by hunting and fishing, while agriculture and livestock breeding were not widespread in those ancient times. Denisov then goes on to describe in detail the ancient Cossack way of life, laws and customs, as well as the ancient stanitsa democracy. He writes that the first Cossacks considered themselves a single people and did not fight among themselves. The first settlers, according to Denisov, did not remain peaceful for long. They were forced to abandon their villages for a time, but later returned "with a large contingent of strangers from among the Great Russians," whom they welcomed into their stanitsas. The first Cossacks then settled along the upper Don, Khopra, and Medveditsa rivers, where they lived for a long time under their old rights and laws. Denisov reports that none of the old-timers knows when these settlers adopted the name Don Cossacks and the Cossack Republic of the Don Host was formed.

Only after this "historical" preamble does Denisov begin to properly recount the history of his family, and then move on to personal recollections of his wars and campaigns, and his service as an ataman. Moreover, the memoirist not only recounts his personal impressions but also recounts traditional Cossack tactics, analyzes them, communicates them to posterity, and summarizes the combat experience of

the Cossacks of his turbulent time.

Thus, the version of the origins and early history of the Cossacks presented in Denisov's memoirs differed radically from the traditional "runaway serf" theory accepted in imperial historiography. As we saw above, it was precisely this "Karamzin" perspective that came to dominate official historiography in the 19th century. Therefore, the very first commentator on the ataman's memoirs, Don Cossack General A.P. Chebotarev, not only subjected the memoirs to significant literary revision, omitting some passages and paraphrasing others. He provided a very extensive commentary on the historical section of the memoirs, arguing that Denisov had been ensnared in all sorts of tall tales about the Cossacks' origins. As a commentator, he then presented the official viewpoint, not forgetting, however, to briefly mention V.D. Sukhorukov, whom we have already become acquainted with.

Ataman Denisov's memoirs first appeared only several decades after the author's death. A. P. Chebotarev published them in the journal *Russkaya Starina* in 1874–1875. The editorial preface stated: "Denisov's notes were written by him in the late twenties or early thirties of the current century. They were written on plain gray paper, in a coherent handwriting, in a semi-literate scribe's hand, under the dictation of Andriyan Karpovich himself, and in some places corrected in his own hand. They consist of 24 notebooks of gray, rough paper, a sheet of 576 pages. These notes have been preserved for the sake of national history and were communicated to the pages of "Russkaya Starina" of the Don Host by Lieutenant-General Adam Petrovich Chebotarev. He received them in 1852 from Denisov's grandson, a retired major of the Ataman's Regiment of His Highness the Heir to the Tsarevich, Andrian Ivanovich Egorov, who placed them at Mr. Chebotarev's complete disposal. In commencing the publication of "The Notes of Ataman Denisov", the editors of "Russkaya Starina" consider it necessary to note that they have been divided into chapters for ease of reading and that all the most historically important parts of these Notes are printed verbatim; then, those parts of Andrian Karpovich Denisov's account in which he cites trivial details that were of interest to him only, have been set out by us in brief; "such as: movements from place to place, route details, notes on the smallest skirmishes with the enemy, etc."

From this "preface," it can be seen that the memoirs have undergone significant editing and revision, yet they nonetheless remain a key monument to Cossack memoir writing and historiography of the first quarter of the 19th century, a historical source for studying Suvorov's military school and Cossack tactics. It should be added that Denisov's memoirs were recently republished, and their electronic version is publicly available on the online library of the "Literature and Life" website. A separate group

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHQ (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

comprises published epistolary works, which, in their characteristics, are similar to diary entries. The following differences between letters as sources and diaries should be noted.

Firstly, letters could be subject to censorship and, therefore, did not always openly reflect certain facts about the state of affairs and the author's point of view that were unflattering for the tsarist government.

Secondly, the letter was intended for a specific addressee and, therefore, did not entirely objectively reflect events related to the author's personal life. A striking example is letters to close relatives, where the author often conceals or distorts events they consider unpleasant for the recipient. Thus, it is quite natural that in his letter to his mother dated August 30, 1830, A. A. Bestuzhev conceals as much as possible his poor health and describes the upcoming expedition as a walk in the park, while in a note dated the same day to his younger brother (Pavel), he begins with the words: "... setting off to fight, I take up my pen to say I'm sorry."

Thirdly, the author of the letter is addressing an addressee who is often unfamiliar with the Cossacks and their unique life and service, and therefore strives to provide explanations, dwelling in detail on local peculiarities, and attempting to capture the local flavor. Therefore, the author does not overlook certain everyday events that he would have long since ceased to notice, particularly the ordinary, sometimes routine, actions of the Cossacks. The Cossacks also found their reflection in the pages of 19th-century literary works, whose authors were direct witnesses to, and sometimes even participants in, the events described. Among these, such classics of Russian literature as A.S. Pushkin, M.Yu. Lermontov, A.A. Bestuzhev, and L.N. Tolstoy occupy a unique place. It is clear that literary works, unlike memoirs, cannot meet the criteria of a historical source. In this case, interest may lie not in the literary merits of a work itself, but in the information and materials underlying it, collected by the author or directly witnessed. Nevertheless, literary works can be used to illustrate the public opinion of the era and its underlying stereotypes. From this perspective, the works of A.S. Pushkin and L.N. Tolstoy, distinguished by their interest in history and a commitment to historical objectivity and documentary writing, are of particular interest. A typical example can be found in L.N. Tolstoy's story "The Cossacks." The narrative thread includes a clearly documentary-historical passage preceding the

main part of the story, in which Tolstoy provides a brief overview of the Greben Cossacks, their culture, and history. Moreover, the writer speaks as an eyewitness and direct witness to the life and daily life of the 19th-century Linear Cossacks.

Conclusion

To summarize our examination of imperial historiography of the Cossacks, we can identify its main characteristics. Its fundamental tenets correspond to the noble-monarchical tradition dating back to Karamzin and are guided by two fundamental principles: Orthodox ideology and loyalty to the throne. This lends a certain rigidity to the works of official authors. The authors were, as a rule, contemporaries, and sometimes direct participants in the events they described, which, to a certain extent, brings them closer to their sources. This is especially true of memoirs.

In imperial historiography, the Cossacks were considered part of the Russian people, a distinct class, granted privileges stipulated by imperial law for their military service to "Faith, Tsar, and Fatherland." The origins of the Cossacks were explained by the "runaway serf theory."

During this same historical period, the first works of Cossack authors began to appear, who, criticizing the "runaway serf theory," attempted to create their own alternative to official historiography.

Regarding rigorous scientific research into the Cossack phenomenon during the imperial period, academic scholarship at the time paid virtually no serious attention to the Cossacks, limiting itself to mere references to them in general works on Russian history. Among the studies of that time, only a few can be identified that touch upon the history of the Cossacks to some extent, but, again, only within the framework of general research.

Thus, we can generally conclude that the imperial period saw the emergence of a national historiography of the Cossacks. During this time, the first specialized studies and publications devoted to the history and culture of the Cossacks appeared, and the search for, introduction into scholarly circulation, study, and publication of historical sources on the Cossacks began. However, the accumulated material was not yet sufficient for a deep and serious study of the phenomenological nature of the Cossacks, so academic scholarship at that time showed little interest in researching their history.

References:

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India)	= 6.317	SIS (USA)	= 0.912	ICV (Poland)	= 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE)	= 1.582	PIIHII (Russia)	= 0.191	PIF (India)	= 1.940
	GIF (Australia)	= 0.564	ESJI (KZ)	= 8.100	IBI (India)	= 4.260
	JIF	= 1.500	SJIF (Morocco)	= 7.184	OAJI (USA)	= 0.350

1. Bogaevsky, B. A. (2024). On the origin of the Cossacks // *Native land: Bulletin of the Don Military Association*. No. 1, Paris.
2. Gordeev, A. A. (2023). *History of the Cossacks*. Moscow: Strastnoy Bulvar, Books 1, 2, 3 – 2022, Book 4 – 2023.
3. Gordeev, A.A. (2024). *History of the Cossacks* / Preface by A.V. Shishova, Moscow: Veche.
4. Grushevsky, M. S. (n.d.). *History of the Ukrainian Cossacks before unification with the Moscow State*. vol. 1–2, Kyiv, 2023–2024.
5. (2025). *Demyan Bedny. Red Cossack*, Moscow: Publishing House of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of Soviets of Russia, K. and K. Deputies.
6. (2023). *Don Cossacks in the Patriotic War of 1812: Collection of materials and documents*. Moscow.
7. (2024). *Yenisei Cossack Army: Bulletin of the Yenisei Cossacks*, Krasnoyarsk.
8. (2025). *Transbaikal Cossack Host. Instructions for stanitsa atamans*. Chita.
9. Zabugina, V. S. (2025). *Cossacks of the Don and Terek in the February and October Revolutions and the Civil War (historiography)*: Vladikavkaz.
10. Ivanov, R. (2024). *A Brief History of the Amur Cossack Host*. Blagoveshchensk.
11. (2023). *Cossacks. Problems of History and Historiography*: Proceedings of the 28th All-Russian Correspondence Scientific Conf. / Ed. by S. N. Poltorak. St. Petersburg.
12. (2023). *Cossacks. Encyclopedia* / Editorial Board: A. P. Fedotov (chief editor) and others. Moscow: Encyclopedia.
13. (2024). *How the Cossacks Fought: Historical Stories about the Zaporizhian Cossacks* / Yu. A. Mytsyk, S. N. Plokyh, I. S. Storozhenko. Dnepropetrovsk: Promin, 2024. (This happened a long time ago).
14. Karaulov, M.A. (2025). *Terek Cossacks in the past and present*. Vladikavkaz.
15. Karaulov, M.A. (2024). *Terek Cossacks*. Moscow: Veche.
16. Korolenko, P.P. (2025). *200th Anniversary of the Kuban Cossack Army (1696–1896)*. Yekaterinodar.
17. Muzhev, I. F. (2023). *Cossacks of the Don, Kuban and Terek in the Revolution (1812 - 1917)* Ordzhonikidze.
18. Korolenko, P.K. (2023). More on the issue of the origin of the Cossacks // *Rodimy Krai*. No. 69. Paris.
19. Pisarev, S. I. (2021). *300th Anniversary of the Terek Cossack Host (1577–1877)*. Vladikavkaz.
20. Radik, A.K. (2024). *Soviet Cossacks*. Rostov-on-Don.