

UDC 930(477):364.054 Khmelnitsky

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.1284189

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6355-6714>

Vita Kotsur
(Pereyaslav-Khmelnytsky)

**THE CHARITABLE ACTIVITY OF HETMAN B. KHMELNITSKY
AS A COMPONENT OF THE SOCIOCULTURAL PHENOMENON
OF THE COSSACK AGE**

The article reveals various aspects of Hetman B. Khmelnitsky's charitable work and reflects this issue in the scientific literature.

The purpose of the article is to establish, on the basis of historiographical analysis of works, primarily historical, devoted to charity in the Cossacks era, in particular, figures of Hetman B. Khmelnitsky, state, completeness and reliability of the study.

Modern domestic researcher claim that B. Khmelnitsky raised Ukrainian Culture to the new, higher level the previous traditions concerning the construction of Orthodox churches, sacrifices for their maintenance,

taken under the protection of their ministers, rightly believing that the consolidated churches will be the best monuments not only to their founder or builder, but also the property of an entire era. B. Khmelnytskyi issued a large number of stationers to the Kiev monasteries, since it was in Kiev that there were the most ancient and most respected monasteries. They were mainly concerned with the transfer of land, settlements, property, etc. In total, according to our calculations, B. Khmelnytsky published 38 versatile people of similar content. Modern Ukrainian historians are unanimous in that the fundamental foundations of charity were laid by B. Khmelnytsky since the first months of the liberation struggle. During the next time, they experienced some changes, but the main thing was that charity was viable and had a long-term character. Scientists emphasize that the undisputed merits of the Hetman was that in the field of military and political events in his activity there was a place for charity. Although they mostly concerned church-monastic charity.

Key words: modern Ukrainian historiography, B. Khmelnytsky, Hetman, charity, Cossack state, sociocultural phenomenon.

The history of philanthropy in Ukraine has been reflected in the scientific literature. But the authors of the relevant research do not go beyond certain fragments of charity history, are limited to a certain time slice, which does not allow to see it as a holistic multidimensional process. There was a need for a comprehensive understanding of philanthropy in Ukrainian history. Particular importance is the study of charity in the Cossack Age, because it is then that it becomes a peculiar phenomenon.

Charity activity continued during the time of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky (1648–1657). The life and work of the prominent statesman and the famous commander are devoted to many scientific and popular scientific works; their authors mostly analyze the political, military, state-building activity of the great hetman, but it is worth remembering and left behind in the field of charity.

The national liberation war had a great influence on socio-cultural processes in Ukrainian lands. The patriotic upsurge covered the broad strata of Ukrainian society. B. Khmelnytsky took care of the support of the national culture, paid attention to the problems and events of the cultural and spiritual life of Ukrainian society, whose integral part was merciful and charitable affairs.

A general picture of the cultural rise of the Khmelnytsky times is found in particular in the notes of Pavel Alepsky [10], who, along with his father, Patriarch Makarios, traveled to Ukraine in 1654 and 1656. P. Alepsky noted the active construction of new Orthodox churches, «happy for our hearts», spreading written language among all strata of the population.

In the Cossack state, since the beginning of its existence, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church has occupied an exceptional position. The ideology of Orthodoxy, the bearer of which was the clergy, became under the protection of the military and economic strength of the Cossacks as an official ideology with a distinct national-political character.

The Church of the Protection of the Most Holy Theotokos was the center of spiritual life. Zaporozhians took care of the «blessing» of their church. According to the immutable custom, from all acquisitions of «sword and oars» the most valuable part was sacrificed to the temple. Well-off Cossacks wrote their goodness to the church and monasteries.

After the campaigns, the Cossacks returned to Sich, the wounded were placed in hospitals and given them «to cure barbers, replacing doctors in Sich, defining a known fee from the general bodies' treasure to the doctors, and finally, after all this, they divided the seized prey into two large batches – one for the gods temples, another for themselves» [18, p. 383].

Zaporizhzhya Sich, in fact, professed the same Christian morality as the brothers, condemned the «vulgar and idiotic», unconditionality, cruelly punished for dishonor, encouraged brotherly love, kindness, generosity, the highness of thought and beauty of the word, taught the fidelity of the Motherland, courage and selflessness in protecting the interests of the people.

As a highly educated person and a true statesman, B. Khmelnytsky took care of the development of education. Hetman realized that fraternity schools, fraternities actively advocate for the preservation and development of national culture, cultivate their own

science, a system of education, on the basis of education unite Ukrainians around the idea of protecting parental faith. There remain a lot of Hetman's orders to give educational institutions privileges and freedoms.

Great attention was given to Khmelnitsky Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium. Understanding the social significance, he, and later his son Yuri (who at that time studied at the college) in every way supported this institution. An example of the provision of material assistance is the order to transfer several villages to the Kyiv Epiphany Monastery, in particular the former Dominican estates, granting the privileges of vintage and honey without taxes, which was an important part of the profits of the Bratsky Monastery. «Hetman Bohdan Khmelnitsky in January 1651, January 11, gave the village Mostitschy and Plesetskoye; and the letter of June 1655, June 18, allowed honey to be eaten and sold, which was confirmed by his son Yuri on May 1660. This last gave another 6 villages of Ksavorov, Muhrid, Chernohodko, the idyllic Rylsky dance in Kyiv and the Dominican church in March 1662» [2, p. 249]. From January 1656 to the Universal Fraternal Monastery, the villages of Xavier, Muhohidy, as well as the villages of Plesetskoye, Chernogorodka, Sarnovichi, Oblast and Bazaar, formerly owned by the Jesuits, were provided with «all things, ponds, mills, hayfields and other ... incomes and with accents» [4, p. 467–468].

In March 1657 Lubensky Mharsky monastery was given a versatile hayfields of Lubens Bernardines [16, p. 217–218], and in July of the same year a confirmation station wagon was issued for the possession of the estates previously owned by the Bernardines [16, p. 237]. Consequently, during the National Liberation War, the monasteries with the help of the Hetman's government, not only returned the belongings that they owned, but also acquired new possessions at the expense of the Catholic Church and the Polish gentry that had fled from Ukraine.

According to the will of B. Khmelnytsky, brothers of the Epiphany Monastery, «Aksakivskyi Puppet» was delivered to Kyiv in Podil [6, p. 570].

In addition to material assistance, the Cossack hetmans supported their high school at various political, diplomatic levels. Thus, B. Khmelnytsky guaranteed the existence of the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium in state treaties with Poland-in Zboriv (1649) and Bila Tserkva (1651) it was confirmed that the board should remain under former rights, according to the old privileges [17, p. 51]. In 1654 B. Khmelnytsky asked the Russian head to support the Bratsky monastery, «where now the school» [4, p. 354–355].

Among the most important and constant tasks of B. Khmelnitsky was the protection of the Orthodox Church, he took the clergy and monasteries under his care, generously gave them land. As Academician VA Smolyi emphasizes, B. Khmelnytsky understood the significance of the religious factor in the development of the National Liberation War and was aware of the fact that the material support of Orthodoxy would strengthen the authority of Hetman's government [13, p. 43]. There are a lot of its universals, letters with warnings, demands, requests not to oppress, protect the rights, return selected estates of the Orthodox Church. Characteristic is one of the letters of B. Khmelnytsky to the Polish senators (1652) concerning the rights to the «Terekhtimirovsky monastery with all its goodness, which was founded for the crippling of our military society», with the statement that «the ancient Greek faith was untouchable and enjoyed its longstanding liberties, as well as that old churches, churches, monasteries, schools, hospitals and other holy places were left with old funds and privileges, and the clergy, older and smaller, and all clerical neonates, so that both the Uniate and others did not interfere with them or hinder them freely go away lyaty worship and enjoy their property» [4, p. 247–249].

B. Khmelnitsky explained his favorable attitude towards the monasteries and churches in the universal verse of the Epiphany monastery in January 1651: «I have a vigilant presence near the blessing of the churches of God and monasticists for the multiplication of praise of God» [4, p. 209–210]. And in the versatile Pustinsky Mikyl monastery in November 1651,

he noted that the Zaporozhian Army always advocated the interests of the Orthodox Church [9, p. 172].

We fully agree with the statement of the Kyiv scholars that the purpose of Hetman's government's charity towards the church was directed toward the future – to secure the support of the clergy in its internal and external policies [8, p. 147].

The hetman and the elder were sympathetic to the monasteries, taking into account their merits to the Orthodox faith, that part of the Orthodox clergy took part in the National Liberation War. The elder considered the clergy to be an ally, since the church had a great influence on the masses and could have supported the organization of the new government by this influence.

B. Khmelnytsky continued the traditions of the Zaporozhian hetmans, colonels, centurions in the construction of Orthodox churches, sacrifices for their maintenance, and the protection of their ministers, rightly believing that the constituted churches would be the best monuments to their founder. Immediately after the end of the first military campaign under Zhovti Vody and Korsun in 1648, «Hetman Khmelnytsky sent to the Divine Church and its ministers three hundred Thalers for the services of the Zaporozhians at the Yellow Waters and Korsun» [18, p. 265; 19, p. 184–185]. In the autumn of 1648 he gave five thousand zlotys to one of the Sokal monasteries for the construction of crypts [12, p. 77], in September, 1656, he allowed the construction of a monastery in Irden, giving him land ownership: the Bachelor and Oryol farms «with their belongings», with a precise description of the borders, «in order to provide us, none of our troops rebelled against the bridge of the holy least inviolability to make» [16, p. 212]. It is widely known at the expense of B. Khmelnytsky in 1656 in the Sabbath-Ilyinsky church [7, p. 70]. At its own expense, the gilded dome of the Cathedral of St. Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery [3, p. 43].

The revival of public life caused by the liberation movement led to the development of architecture and monumental and decorative art, which was found in the church and secular construction. Himself B. Khmelnytsky has deprived himself of the universal with the orders for the preservation and repair of urban structures in Kiev, the capital city [4, p. 265, 663], «memory of the Hetman's chambers» in Chyhyryn, Pereyaslav, Mirgorod [11, p. 92]. B. Khmelnytsky provided them with special guardian wards, such as Gustinsky (near Pryluk), Mikhailovsky, Flora and Lavra (Kyiv), Mezhygirsky and others, while guarding Orthodox monasteries [15, p. 138].

B. Khmelnytsky issued a large number of stationers to the Kiev monasteries, since it was in Kiev that there were the most ancient and most respected monasteries. Hetman's government did everything possible in order to secure the support of these monasteries.

In December 1651, B. Khmelnytsky ordered the atamans and residents of the villages of Khatsk and Golovyatin not to do any damage in Buzuk, a farm of the Pechersk Monastery, taking into account the universalists «from the fifty years and past hetmans of the Army of our Zaporozhye on that ground provides» [4, p. 236–237].

Mezhygirsky monastery in December 1653 received from the Hetman village Chernin «with subjects in the used forever with all the belongings, accessories, from ancient hours to that village belonging» [4, p. 310], and in March 1656 – the town of Vyshgorod with the villages of Petrovka and Moshchany [4, p. 477–479].

The abbot of the Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery, B. Khmelnytskyi, in May 1654, gave the town Vygurvshchyna and ordered that «in the middle of everywhere, the property of Ingush arrived, and nobody returned to the land of the land, and did not take the snowshoe» [4, p. 346–348].

In August 1656, the hetman of St. Michael's Monastery gave the town of Khodosyivka and the village of Krenichi, «so that they could legitimize ... where to obtain bread» [4, p. 528–529].

In total, according to our calculations, versatile people of similar content were published by B. Khmelnytsky as much as 38.

Certain changes were observed in the content of universals that concerned the relationship between Orthodox monasteries and peasants. If in the summer of 1648 the Hetman emphasized the inviolability of the monastery's property, it forbade to record the monastic peasants from the Cossacks; later, the emphasis was placed on ensuring that the peasants fulfilled all due duties in favor of the monastery. Thus, from December 22, the villagers Vyshenik, Veliky, and Malchik Dmitrovich, who belonged to the Kiev judge Humenitsky, had to «inhale the cabal of the vespers by the custom of the old», according to the «timekeeping» period, to give it to the Floriv monastery [4, p. 88]. Universal from December 28, peasants Pidhireds received an order «according to old obedience» to give the Pechersk maiden monastery [4, p. 89]. According to researchers, the terms «inhale the covenant of vespers, the custom of the old», «by the old», often used in hetman universals, meant the requirement to fulfill the obligations that existed before the National Liberation War. Consequently, the peasants had to perform work only if it was practiced here before [14, p. 78].

Thus, the fundamental foundations of charity were laid down by B. Khmelnytsky since the first months of the liberation struggle. During the next time, they experienced some changes, but the main thing was that charity was viable and had a long-term character [13, p. 42]. It is characteristic that the question of the support of the Orthodox Church and monasteries practically did not go down from the agenda of the program documents of B. Khmelnytsky and other hetmans [13, p. 43].

M. Hrushevsky considered the day of B. Khmelnytsky «a great stage in the campaign of the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian masses for their social, political, cultural and national ideals ... From Khmelnytsky, the Ukrainian life begins, and Khmelnytsky ... will be the hero of Ukrainian history» [5, p. 280–281]. With a variety of views on B. Khmelnytsky and his time, «it is impossible to deny the fact that it was he who imposed an interrupted ... the thread of Ukrainian statehood, and the Ukrainian Cossack state created by him once again introduced the Ukrainian people into a family of independent peoples with its own national life» [5, p. 281]. The undisputed merit of the hetman of the Ukrainian state was the fact that in the field of military and political events in his activity there was a place for charity.

The practice of confirming the monasteries of previous possessions and providing new in the second half of the XVII century. became a tradition. All hetmans, imitating Bohdan Khmelnytsky, as well as striving to strengthen their position with support from the church's top, gave the church and monasteries wide rights to previous and new possessions.

Confirmatory universals were not accidental. They have become one of the ways of acquiring land for some monasteries, they were of protective importance for securing against various attacks, and some monasteries were further used by hetman universals to expand their possessions.

Monasteries sought to receive confirmation versatile people in their estates in each new Hetman. Thus, during Hetman B. Khmelnytsky Lubensky Mgarsky Monastery received eight different versatile people in their possession. Y. Khmelnytsky issued to the monastery 7 versatile people, I. Briukhovetsky – 5, D. Mnogohrishny – 7, I. Vyhovsky – 9, P. Doroshenko – 3, I. Samoilovich – 10, I. Mazepa – 15, I. Skoropadsky – 11 [1, p. 8–9].

Interesting is the structure of the awards granted by the hetmans. For example, both B. Khmelnytsky and I. Vygovsky, most of the new possessions were given to monasteries (respectively, 55% and 50%). According to B. Khmelnytsky, in the second place were sentenced officers (26%), then gentry (9%), priests (5.5%), etc. According to I. Vygovsky, the priest accounted for 25%, the rest belonged to the nobility and elders (by 12.5%) [20, p. 62].

So, after analyzing the works of scholars concerning the charitable work of B. Khmelnytsky, we conclude that charitable and patriotic activities of the Cossack age as an organic component of the multifaceted activity of the Ukrainian elite should be regarded

as a certain policy in the cultural and spiritual sphere. One can agree with the researchers that the essence of such activity was not in charity as such: it was rather a social duty, an indispensable attribute of belonging to the elite, a conscious state position aimed at creating a cultural environment that would meet high criteria.

Modern scholars-historians are unanimous that charitable and charitable activities of Ukrainian hetmans, Cossack elders and ordinary Cossacks are not just separate acts of well-known personalities or groups of individuals, but the manifestation of social relations of a particular historical period, the sociocultural phenomenon of his time. As a historical phenomenon, their charity-patronage activities are of high moral quality, testifying to the ethical norms of people, the priorities of society.

ДЖЕРЕЛА ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Астряб М.Г. Лубенский Мгарский Свято-Преображенский монастырь // Труды Полтавской ученой архивной комиссии. Полтава, 1915. Вып. 13. С. 8–9.
2. Болховітінів Євгеній, митрополит. Вибрані праці з історії Києва. Київ: Либідь, 1995. 488 с.
3. Вечерський В.В. Втрачені об'єкти архітектурної спадщини України. Київ, 2002. 592 с.
4. Документи Богдана Хмельницького (1648–1657). Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР, 1961. 739 с.
5. Дорошенко Д. Нарис історії України. Львів: Світ, 1991. 576 с.
6. Києво-Могилянська академія в іменах, XVII–XVIII ст.: енцикл. вид. / упоряд. З.І. Хижняк; за ред. В.С. Брюховецького. Київ: Вид. дім «КМ Академія», 2001. 736 с.
7. Кілессо С. Суботів // Пам'ятки України. 1994. № 3–6. С. 70.
8. Крижанівський О.П., Плохій С.М. Історія церкви та релігійної думки в Україні: навч. посібник: у 3-х кн. Кн. 3: Кінець XVII – середина XIX століття. Київ, 1994. 335 с.
9. Крип'якевич І.П. Богдан Хмельницький. Вид. 2-е, випр. і доп. Львів: Світ, 1990. 408 с.
10. Путешествие Антиохийского патриарха Макария в Россию в половине XVII века. Москва, 1896. 228 с.
11. Січинський В. Чужинці про Україну. Київ: Довіра, 1992. 256 с.
12. Смолій В.А., Степанков В.С. Богдан Хмельницький: хроніка життя та діяльності. Київ: Наук. думка, 1994. 262 с.
13. Смолій В.А. Принципи соціальної політики і поведінки. Соціальні ідеали // Українське суспільство на зламі середньовіччя і нового часу: нариси з історії ментальності та національної свідомості. Київ, 2001. С. 32–54.
14. Степанков В.С. Социальная политика гетманской администрации в годы Освободительной войны украинского народа (1648–1654 гг.) и борьба против нее крестьянства и казацкой гольтыбы // История СССР. 1979. № 3. С. 71–84.
15. Ступак Ф.Я. Добродійно-меценатська діяльність Богдана Хмельницького // Пам'ять століть. 2004. № 1. С. 135–142.
16. Універсали Богдана Хмельницького. 1648–1657. Київ: НАН України, Ін-т іст., 1998. 324 с.
17. Хижняк З.І. Києво-Могилянська академія. Київ: Вища школа, 1981. 235 с.
18. Яворницький Д.І. Історія запорозьких козаків: у 3-х т. Київ: Наук. думка, 1990. Т. 1. 592 с.
19. Яворницький Д.І. Історія запорозьких козаків: у 3-х т. Київ: Наук. думка, 1990. Т. 2. 560 с.
20. Яковлева Т. Гетьманщина в другій половині 50-х років XVII століття: Причини і початок Руїни. Київ: Основи, 1998. 447 с.

REFERENCES

1. Astryab M.G. *Lubenskiy Mgarskiy Svyato-Preobrazhenskiy monastyr'* [Lubensky Mgarsky Holy Transfiguration Monastery]. Proceedings of the Poltava Academic Archival Commission. Poltava, 1915, Izp. 13, pp. 8–9.
2. Bolkhovitinov Yevhenii, mytropolyt. *Vybrani pratsi z istorii Kyieva* [Selected Works on the History of Kyiv]. Kyiv: Lybid, 1995. 488 p.

3. Vecherskyi V.V. *Vtracheni obiekty arkhitekturnoi spadshchyny Ukrainy* [Lost objects of architectural heritage of Ukraine]. Kyiv, 2002. 592 p.
4. *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnytskoho (1648–1657)* [Documents of Bogdan Khmelnytsky (1648–1657)]. Kyiv: View of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1961. 739 p.
5. Doroshenko D. *Narys istorii Ukrainy* [Essay on the History of Ukraine]. Lviv: World, 1991. 576 p.
6. *Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia v imenakh, XVII–XVIII st.: entsykl. vyd.* [Kyiv Mohyla Academy in names, XVII–XVIII centuries.: encyclopedia. kind.] Order Z.I. Khizhnyak; for ed. V.S. Bryukhovetsky. Kyiv: View. House «KM Academy», 2001. 736 p.
7. Kileso S. *Subotiv* [Subotov]. Sights of Ukraine, 1994, No. 3–6, p. 70.
8. Kryzhanivskiy O.P., Plokhii S.M. *Istoriia tserkvy ta relihiinoi dumky v Ukraini* [History of the Church and Religious Thought in Ukraine]: Teach. manual: in 3 books. Kn. 3: the end of the XVII – the middle of the XIX century. Kyiv, 1994. 335 p.
9. Kryp'iakevych I.P. *Bohdan Khmelnytskyi* [Bogdan Khmelnytsky]. Kind. 2nd, vers and add. Lviv: World, 1990. 408 p.
10. *Puteshestvie Antiokhiyskogo patriarkha Makariya v Rossiyu v polovine XVII veka* [The journey of the Antiochian Patriarch Macarius to Russia in the half of the XVII century]. Moscow, 1896. 228 p.
11. Sichynskiy V. *Chuzhyntsi pro Ukrainu* [Chutzyntsi about Ukraine]. Kyiv: Trust, 1992. 256 p.
12. Smolii V.A., Stepankov V.S. *Bohdan Khmelnytskyi: khronika zhyttia ta diialnosti* [Bogdan Khmelnytsky: A Chronicle of Life and Activity]. Kyiv: Science. opinion, 1994. 262 p.
13. Smolii V.A. *Pryntsypy sotsialnoi polityky i povedinky. Sotsialni ideally* [Principles of social policy and behavior. Social Ideals]. Ukrainian society at the turn of the Middle Ages and the New Times: essays on the history of mentality and national consciousness. Kyiv, 2001, pp. 32–54.
14. Stepankov V.S. *Sotsial'naya politika getmanskoj administratsii v roky Osvoboditel'noy voyny ukrainskogo naroda (1648–1654 gg.) i bor'ba protiv nee krest'yanstva i kazatskoy golyt'by* [Social policy of Hetman's administration during the years of the Liberation War of the Ukrainian people (1648–1654) and the struggle against it by the peasantry and the Cossack scapegoats]. History of the USSR, 1979, No. 3, pp. 71–84.
15. Stupak F.Ya. *Dobrodiino-metsenatska diialnist Bohdana Khmelnytskoho* [Charity and patronage of Bogdan Khmelnytsky]. Memory of the Centuries, 2004, No. 1, pp. 135–142.
16. *Universaly Bohdana Khmelnytskoho. 1648–1657* [Versatiles Bogdan Khmelnytsky. 1648–1657]. Kyiv: NAS of Ukraine, Institute of History, 1998. 324 p.
17. Khyzhniak Z.I. *Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia* [Kyiv-Mohyla Academy]. Kyiv: Higher school, 1981. 235 p.
18. Yavornytskyi D.I. *Istoriia zaporozkykh kozakiv* [History of Zaporozhye Cossacks]: in 3 volumes. Kyiv: Science. Thought, 1990. T. 1. 592 p.
19. Yavornytskyi D.I. *Istoriia zaporozkykh kozakiv* [History of Zaporozhye Cossacks]: in 3 volumes. Kyiv: Science. Thought, 1990. T. 2. 560 p.
20. Yakovleva T. *Hetmanshchyna v druhii polovyni 50-kh rokiv XVII stolittia: Prychyny i pochatok Ruiny* [Hetmanate in the second half of the 50-ies of the XVII century: Causes and the beginning of the ruins]. Kyiv: Fundamentals, 1998. 447 p.

Коцур В. Благодійна діяльність гетьмана Б. Хмельницького як складова соціокультурного феномену козацької доби.

У статті розкриваються різні аспекти благодійної діяльності гетьмана Б. Хмельницького та відображення даного питання в науковій літературі.

Метою статті є встановлення на основі історіографічного аналізу праць, насамперед історичних, присвячених благодійності в козацьку добу, зокрема, постаті гетьмана Б. Хмельницького, стану, повноти і достовірності дослідження.

Сучасними вітчизняними дослідниками з'ясовано, що Б. Хмельницький підніс на новий, вищий рівень попередні традиції щодо спорудження православних храмів, жертвування на їх утримання, взяття під захист їх служителів, справедливо вважаючи, що зведені церкви будуть кращими пам'ятниками не лише своєму засновнику чи будівничому, а й надбаннями цілої епохи. Значну кількість універсалів Б. Хмельницький видав київським монастирям, адже саме в Києві знаходились найдавніші та найшанованіші монастирі. Стосувались вони переважно передачі земель, населених пунктів, майна

тощо. Всього, за нашими підрахунками, Б. Хмельницьким видано 38 універсалів подібного змісту. Сучасні українські історики одностайні в тому, що фундаментальні основи благодійності були закладені Б. Хмельницьким уже з перших місяців визвольної боротьби. Протягом наступного часу вони зазнавали певних змін, однак головним було те, що благодійництво виявилось життєздатним і мало довгостроковий характер. Науковці наголошують, що безперечною заслугою гетьмана було те, що у вирі воєнних і політичних подій у його діяльності знайшлося місце для добродійних справ. Хоча вони переважно стосувались церковно-монастирської благодійності.

Ключові слова: сучасна українська історіографія, Б. Хмельницький, гетьман, благодійність, доброчинність, козацька держава, соціокультурний феномен.

Одержано 2.03.2018.