

UDC 94(477.4)“1861”:271.2-722
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226554

Vitaliy TATSIYENKO

PhD (History), Assistant Professor of History of Ukraine Chair, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 28 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20300 (tatsiyenko1990@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0003-3372-9765

Researcher ID: D-7640-2019

Natalia TATSIYENKO

PhD (History), Assistant Professor of History of Ukraine Chair, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 28 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20300 (tatsiyenko_natalia@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-7872-9008

Researcher ID: D-7639-2019

Віталій ТАЦІЄНКО

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 28, м. Умань, Україна, індекс 20300, (tatsiyenko1990@ukr.net)

Наталія ТАЦІЄНКО

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Уманського державного педагогічного університету імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 28, м. Умань, Україна, індекс 20300 (tatsiyenko_natalia@ukr.net)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Tatsiyenko, V. & Tatsiyenko, N. (2021). The Orthodox parish clergy's role in the peasant reform implementation in 1861 (based on Kyiv huberniya materials). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 18, 55–63. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.18.226554

THE ORTHODOX PARISH CLERGY'S ROLE IN THE PEASANT REFORM IMPLEMENTATION IN 1861 (BASED ON KYIV HUBERNIYA MATERIALS)

Abstract. The purpose of the research is – to clarify the Orthodox parish clergy's role in the peasant reform implementation in 1861, based on Kyiv huberniya (province) materials **The methodology of the research** includes the main principles of systematization, scientificity, historicism, as well as the use of general scientific methods of analysis, synthesis, generalization, comparison. **The scientific novelty** is that the authors, having used published and previously unused archival sources, materials of periodicals, showed the Orthodox parish clergy importance in the peasant reform of 1861 on the example of Kyiv huberniya (province). **The Conclusions.** During the peasant reform implementation, the authorities used the nationalized Orthodox Church for the ideological support actively, as its influence on the population was significant. The parish clergy's activities were regulated by the central church and diocesan administrations' instructions, which, threatened the “strict responsibility”, demanded that an arbitrary, and even more incorrect, explanation of the manifesto should be avoided. In the church

periodicals (“Kyiv Diocesan Gazette”, “The Guide for the Rural Pastors”) which were published for the clergy, the samples of sermons on this purely secular event could be found. The Orthodox clergy were obliged to form a positive assessment of the agrarian transformation, to promote the “correct” understanding of the peasant reform, to perform duties in favor of the landlords, to present it as the Emperor’s care. A particularly important task that the parish priests undertook to perform was to fight the protests among the peasantry, who were dissatisfied with the agrarian transformations’ predatory nature in 1861. The Orthodox Church, as part of the state apparatus, performed the demanded task successfully, in particular, approved and blessed the peasant reform.

Key words: peasant reform of 1861, the Orthodox clergy, landowner, Kyiv huberniya.

РОЛЬ ПРАВОСЛАВНОГО ПАРАФІЯЛЬНОГО ДУХОВЕНСТВА У ПРОВЕДЕННІ СЕЛЯНСЬКОЇ РЕФОРМИ 1861 р. (НА МАТЕРІАЛАХ КИЇВСЬКОЇ ГУБЕРНІЇ)

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* – з’ясування на матеріалах Київської губернії ролі православного парафіяльного духовенства у впровадженні селянської реформи 1861 р. **Методологія дослідження** включає головні принципи системності, науковості, історизму, а також використання загальнонаукових методів аналізу, синтезу, узагальнення, порівняння. **Наукова новизна** роботи полягає у тому, що автори, використовуючи опубліковані та раніше неживдані архівні джерела, матеріали періодичних видань, на прикладі Київської губернії показали значення православного парафіяльного духовенства у проведенні селянської реформи 1861 р. **Висновки.** В ході реалізації селянської реформи влада активно використовувала одержавлену Православну церкву для ідеологічної підтримки, адже її вплив на населення був значним. Діяльність парафіяльних священно- і церковнослужителів регламентувалась інструкціями центральної церковної та єпархіальної адміністрації, які погрожуючи “суворою відповідальністю”, вимагали уникати довільного, а тим більше невірного пояснення маніфесту. В церковній періодиці (“Киевских епархиальных ведомостях”, “Руководстве для сельских пастырей”) для священнослужителів публікувалися зразки проповідей, присвячених цій суто світській події. Православному духовенству ставилось у обов’язок формувати позитивну оцінку аграрним перетворенням, сприяти “правильному” розумінню селянством реформи, виконанню повинностей на користь поміщиків, подавати її як турботу імператора. Особливо важливим завданням, яке зобов’язувало виконувати парафіяльні священнослужителі, була боротьба з протестними настроями серед селянства, яке виявляло незадоволення грабіжницьким характером аграрних перетворень 1861 р. Православна церква, будучи частиною державного апарату, досить успішно виконувала завдання, що полягали у схваленні та благословінні селянської реформи, чого від неї так вимагала влада.

Ключові слова: селянська реформа 1861 р., православне духовенство, поміщик, Київська губернія.

The Problem Statement. Taking into consideration the nature and scale of change, the period of the 60-ies – 70-ies of the XIXth century went down in history as “major reforms” that gave a powerful impetus to modernization processes in Ukraine. The peasant reform was one of the many innovations introduced by the government of Alexander II, and it became one of the main modernization’s drivers. The authorities used the Orthodox Church to ensure reform actively. The Orthodox Church was obliged to form a positive assessment of the agrarian transformation, to fight the protest mood among the peasantry.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. The peasant reform’s subject has significant historiography, which is one of the most powerful in historical science. However, some issue aspects still need to be reconsidered and further studied, in particular, the Orthodox parish clergy’s role in the peasant reform implementation in 1861. The researcher, D. Poyda covered the relationship question between the peasantry and the clergy, the church ministers’

importance in the reform's implementation (Poyda, 1962, pp. 113–127; Poyda, 1983, pp. 130–135). One more researcher, T. Kuznets considered the agrarian transformations' peculiarities in Kyiv huberniya (province) and the Orthodox clergy's position on its approval (Kuznets, 2008, pp. 15–21). The secular's and spiritual's power interaction in the reform's preparation and implementation, the help of the church to state structures during the mass peasant unrest were studied by Ye. Mokshina (Mokshina, 2011, pp. 170–173) and Ye. Matveeva (Matveeva, 2013, pp. 1–9). V. Pererva (Pererva, 2012, pp. 152–160) analyzed the agrarian transformations' impact on the church life of the Right Bank of Ukraine, in particular the introduction into the church calendar of special services dedicated to purely secular events, new holidays, changes in the titles of churches in the region. O. Korotkova (Korotkova, 2019, pp. 27–33), analyzed the causes and consequences of the growth of the Ukrainian peasantry antagonistic attitudes towards the clergy in the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth centuries, noted that the agrarian reform caused a decline in the church's authority. Yu. Khytrovska (Khytrovska, 2017, pp. 19–28) analyzed the public attitude to the Orthodox Church and the clergy's influence on the population of the Right Bank of Ukraine.

The purpose of the article is to cover the Orthodox parish clergy's role in the peasant reform implementation in 1861, based on Kyiv huberniya (province) materials.

The Basic Material Statement. Due to the ecclesiastical reform, brought in by Peter I, ecclesiastical authority became secular, and the Holy Synod became a ministry of religious affairs essentially. The Orthodox Church was clamped by the state. The clergy entrusted a significant number of government assignments to the clergy, especially the range of extracurricular responsibilities expanded in the XIXth century. The clerics were used by the authorities as an ideological tool, a tool in achieving social peace. In particular, in 1800 Kyiv eparchy's parishioners undertook to make every effort to appease the parishioners in case of their "disobedience to the owners" (Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv – CSHAK, f. 127, d. 354, c. 162, pp. 2–10). The government, with a peace keeping mission, involved the parish clergy actively during the inventory and peasant reforms, Kyiv Cossacks, and mass peasant riots at the beginning of the XXth century, etc. The evidence concerning the scale of the non-religious responsibilities that the authorities imposed on the clergy was the performance by them of even seemingly uncharacteristic police functions. The authorities even encroached on such an intimate thing as a confession. Ever since Peter's time, the law required breaking the secrecy of confession, although it contradicted the canons, and reporting evil intentions, criminal actions against the state and especially the Emperor. Even the word with which the priest addressed the faithful was controlled. The church preached the church as one of the means to maintain the existing order, social peace and used it to form a "correct" public opinion.

Hence, it is not surprising that during the period of the peasant reform, the authorities used the nationalized church for ideological support actively, as its influence on the population was significant. It was the parish priests, who played an extremely important role in the reform's implementation.

Anticipating the possibility of discontent and unrest among the peasantry, the authorities were aware of the benefits of the church to appease them. On the eve of the reform, special instruction for the parish clergy was sent to each diocese throughout the empire. The circular of the Holy Synod entrusted the clergy with a "sacred duty" to promote a correct understanding of the reform by the peasantry. It was stated that "it is always the duty of the priest to teach the parishioners that they should be faithful to the emperor and obey his superiors, that they should perform lawful duties steadily and conscientiously and pay

certain taxes and dues imposed or established” (CSHAK, f. 127, d. 699, c. 170, pp. 1–2). The priests were obliged to carry out the ideological work from the church pulpit and in home conversations unobtrusively. And in the church periodicals (“Diocesan Gazette”, “The Guide for the Rural Pastors”) for the clergy published samples of sermons on this purely secular event (Pererva, 2012, p. 153). It was required to explain to the peasants that the reform was “the fruit of the Emperor’s paternal care” and to form “gratitude and a zealous desire to justify the Emperor’s care and hope” (CSHAK, f. 127, d. 699, c. 170, pp. 1–2).

The church administration entrusted the function of peacekeepers during the reform only to the priests. The priests were required to warn the clergy, so that, first, hearing the peasants’ reflections on the manifesto on the 19th of February, they would not support them, given the lack of awareness in this matter, so as not to provoke unrest; secondly, if they witnessed the parishioners’ conversations, who posed a threat to the general peace, they had to “immediately and faithfully” inform the priest (CSHAK, f. 127, d. 699, c. 170, p. 2).

It should be noted that the circular emphasized specifically that priests should not show that they were performing this peacekeeping function especially by the government’s order.

In addition, similar appeals to the parish clergy could also be found in the church periodicals. In particular, the pages of “Kyiv Diocesan Gazette” stated that the priests should form beliefs among the believers that their release does not take place immediately, but gradually over a period of two years specified in the manifesto. Until its end, the peasants had to be “in the same order and perfect obedience to the landlords”. The pastors were also required to contain excessive expectations that could lead to violations of the landowners’ rights (Yeparkhialnaya khronika, 1861, pp. 96–97).

Furthermore, the clergy mediation issue between the landlords and the peasants in order to establish “peaceful relations” was also discussed in the columns of “The Guide for the Rural Pastors”. It was emphasized that the priests should “protect the idea of freedom from exaggeration, point out the line where the riot and the arbitrariness begin <...> especially in the hearts of the liberated gratitude to our most merciful monarch, inspire obedience to the authorities, inspire confidence and love for the landlords and reassure that the government cares for the good of all, that the wisdom of the authorities, at a certain time, will successfully bring to the desired end the cause of the peasants’ liberation” (Neskolko slov, 1861, pp. 385–386).

As the government was in anticipation of the mass protests, the following measures to minimize them and mobilize all forces were taken. In addition, the day of the manifesto’s signing was a well-kept secret. Even the Orthodox Church was on the qui vive and the troops were put on alert.

The government’s prudent predictions about the peasantry’s dissatisfaction with the reform, which they feared so much, came true. Numerous protests happened, for example, in nine Ukrainian huberniya (provinces) during 1855 101 peasant demonstrations took place, in 1856 – 82, in 1857 – 191, in 1858 – 190, in 1859 – 63 and in 1860 – 81 demonstrations. Moreover, 622 performances took place in Ukraine during January – May 1861 (Reient, 2011, p. 38). It is no coincidence that the legislation was planned to be promulgated not during the stormy week of oil, which ended on the 5th of March, but during Lent, when the church called on the people to humbling. In particular, the Minister of Internal Affairs S. Lanskyi warned all governors about it on the 12th of February (Reient, 2011, p. 39). Eventually, the “great gift” of the autocrat arrived in Kyiv on the 10 of March “on Friday of the first week of Lent”. At the end of the liturgy, the manifesto was read in all city churches. On the same day, it was sent to Kyiv huberniya (province) povit (counties) (Yeparkhialnaya khronika, 1861, p. 95).

The manifesto's promulgation took place solemnly in the churches in the presence of the local officials, landowners and the clergy. After getting acquainted with the manifesto, prayers for the king were held. In many places processions were held with the transfer of especially revered icons, the peasants collected funds for the construction of churches, chapels in memory of the liberation, the purchase of icons and royal portraits (Mokshina, 2011, p. 172).

In the church periodicals, there were mass reports that the peasants perceived the manifesto provisions with "joy", "deeply felt Tsar's love and mercy". For example, there were local diocesan records, which described the serfdom abolition's perception by the residents of the villages of Selezenivka and Tsanivka in Skvyra povit (county). After reading the manifesto on the 21st of March by a senior member of Skvyra Povit (county) Police, the villagers expressed a desire to purchase a portrait of Alexander II, asking permission to place it in the church, "so that they and their children will forever remember the generous mercy of the Emperor and pray for His Majesty" (*Blagodarnoe chuvstvo krestyan Kievskoy gubernii, po obyavlenii im manifesta 19 fevralya, 1861 goda, 1861, p. 387*). Informed about it the governor-general I. Vasylychikov sent a portrait, with the recommendation to place it in church school. As a result, after receiving a "precious gift" on the 5th of April, the faithful asked the local priest O. Vasylevskyi to offer three prayers with an akathist for the Emperor's health in three days. And on the 10th of June in 1861, the portrait was decorated with a gold frame.

In a way, the residents of the village Puhachivka, Vasylykiv povit (district) expressed their gratitude for their freedom. On the 15th of June in 1861, the peasants addressed the priest with the following request: "Pray to God, Father, for our good and merciful Tsar; we now see that things are better for us; we now see that our Tsar has mercy on us". In turn, the priest suggested that the community establish the image of St. Alexander Nevsky in the church, to which the faithful agreed. At the same time, the priest remarked to the villagers on the need to "holly" fulfill the obligations to the landowner and reminded of his "generous promise to give manor land to those of his peasants who will remain obedient to him until their final liberation" (*Blagodarnoe chuvstvo, 1861, pp. 388–389*). The peasants replied the following: "Let others do whatever they want, and we will do everything as God commanded and as the Tsar wants" (*Blagodarnoe chuvstvo, 1861, p. 389*).

Consequently, such articles pursued a propaganda goal, forming public opinion on the assessment of the ongoing peasant reform (Kuznets, 2008, p. 20).

The main motive declared in the manifesto, which prompted the authorities to eliminate serfdom, was "love and care for all our loyal subjects". The peasantry, on the other hand, was to accept with gratitude the rights granted, to be imbued with a feeling of love and devotion to the autocrat, and to "deeply feel the Tsar's care and mercy". In fact, the peasantry met the liberation from serfdom with disappointment. They were outraged by the predatory nature of the reform, so there were mass cases when the peasantry refused to believe what the local priests were reading. They believed that this was not a real royal manifesto, but fabricated by the landowners, who hid the real will. Often this indignation was directed at the parish clergy, who the peasants believed were "reading lies". The priests disobeyed the landlords massively, refused to perform their duties. The peasantry openly opposed the main provisions of the reform as they did not receive the paramount thing –land and freedom. This is not surprising, because the reform implementation was in the hands of those people, who were its opponents, so all the socio-economic issues facing the peasantry were not resolved. Even the manifesto's author, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna Philaret (Drozdov), who at that time was one of the most authoritative church figures in the Russian Empire, did not approve

the reform. The reform was carried out at the expense of the peasantry, hence, its predatory nature cultivated among the peasantry protest sentiments.

After the manifesto's promulgation, diverse complaints were made concerning its misinterpretation, including by the clergy, which led to the refusal to perform duties in favor of the landlords. Both the secular and ecclesiastical authorities responded immediately. The diocesan administration threatened the "strict responsibility", demanded to avoid arbitrary, let alone incorrect, manifesto explanation and to follow the relevant instructions.

Despite the categorical church administration's prohibition to explain the provisions of the manifesto to the villagers, such cases did occur. According to the report, issued on the 8th of May in 1861, the district police officer L. Lund addressed to Kyiv governor P. Hesse concerning the fact that Deacon M. Orlovskiy from the village of Kashperivka, Tarashchanskyi district, visiting the faithful during the light week (April 23–29), during the feast announced that "it is not necessary to work more than women" (Baran, 1988, p. 281). As a result, L. Lund ordered to send a clergyman to the prison in Tarashcha town until Kyiv governor made a decision. A similar situation occurred in the villages of Svytynets and Sosnivka in Berdychiv district, where the peasants refused to work for landlords "because the deacon Fotiy Shpotakovskiy read to us that way". It forced the authorities to bring a company of the Alexopol Regiment to these villages and severely punish five residents of the village Svytynets, who showed the most disobedience (Baran, 1988, p. 306).

Sometimes the manifesto's misinterpretation by the priests themselves led to the peasants' refusal to perform serfdom. Yes, in the village of Pedynivka of Zvenyhorod district, a peasant F. Shcherbak announced to the community that "whoever starts working for servitude will be cursed three times" (Baran, 1988, p. 296). In addition, the local priest V. Kremenskyi, who was accused of drinking, in a state of intoxication told the peasants, who turned to him after handing them a provision that had a decree and now "men should work only on condition with the landlord, and women there is no servitude" (Baran, 1988, p. 297). Consequently, the peasants began to evade duties. Therefore, the senior official of special assignments of Kyiv, Podilsk and Volyn governors-general Matushevych proposed Kyiv governor P. Hesse to appoint another priest instead of V. Kremenskyi (Baran, 1988, p. 300).

Often the reason for the peasants refusal to perform their duties in favor of the landlord was incorrect explanations of non-natives, as happened, for example, in Berdychiv district. After reading the regulations by retired non-commissioned officer F. Sobolevskiy, farmers in several villages were convinced that it was necessary to work only on foot for men one day a week. The dissemination of this information and similar rumors resulted in non-performance of duties in several dozen villages of the povit (county). The authorities were forced to deploy military units and punish the most active severely. Accordingly, when the priests, explaining the provisions of the manifesto, stressed the need to continue to blame the serfdom – it turned into conflict situations, because the peasants did not accept such an interpretation. Thus, in the villages of Nova Hreblya and Leonardivka in Berdychiv district, the priest L. Trembovskiy, who explained to the faithful the need to continue to perform their duties until two years after the publication of the manifesto, the villagers did not believe and shouted that the priest "reads a lie" (Baran, 1988, p. 304).

It should be noted that the clergy's authority was negatively affected by the duties' preservation in favor of the stories introduced by the regulations of 1842, after the serfdom abolition (allocation of 33 acres of land, cultivation of priestly allotments, providing the clergy with housing, farm buildings). By a separate order, issued on 1861, Kyiv governor

emphasized the obligation to continue to perform duties for the benefit of the parish clergy. Maintaining the obligation to cultivate church lands after the abolition of serfdom became increasingly dangerous for the Orthodox Church. The local secular and the church administrations were well aware of this (CSHAK, f. 442, d. 815, c. 118, pp. 10–11). In particular, reporting on the diocese state in 1865, Metropolitan Arseniy (Moskvin) noted that in some places the “good old relationship” between the parishioners and the pastors, while performing the obligatory cultivation of priestly plots, turned into conflict situations, and the duty “seems a continuation of the hated serfdom from which they were recently liberated” (CSHAK, f. 127, d. 1023, c. 180, p. 2). And only on the 1st of January in 1868, the obligation to work for the church was abolished.

In 1862, a new wave of mass peasant movement arose, caused by the conclusion of charters, which recorded the transition of serfs to the status of temporary conscripts. Therefore, the government again turned for support to the clergy, especially to the parish priests. They were given a special role in the further reform implementation. In each parish, the appearance of the charter became not only a public but also a church holiday. On this day, the clergy and from neighboring parishes were involved in the liturgy, conducting a solemn service, which usually took place during the temple feast. After the liturgy, as a rule, the clergy served a prayer service, which proclaimed Tsar-Liberator Alexander II longevity. In addition, the clergy on the occasion of such an event delivered not so much religious as political sermons (Pererva, 2012, p. 154).

In accordance with Metropolitan Arseniy's (Moskvin) order, issued on the 17th of May in 1862, “Kyiv Diocesan Gazette” published “A word to temporarily obliged peasants”, which the parish priests of the diocese were supposed to read and accompany with the pastoral conversations “in the same spirit”, especially in those areas where the charters were not concluded yet or where the peasants were worried. Referring to God's Commandments, the clergy put emphasis on the sinfulness not only of encroaching on the landed estates, but also of the very idea of obtaining them, as it contradicted the Eighth Commandment “Thou shalt not steal!” and the Tenth Commandment “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods”. The emphasis was put on the judgments' injustice that the land of the landlords, which they officially owned (acquired or inherited), should belong to the peasants “without any remuneration and without agreement with them, the rightful owners”. The pastors' duty was to form the parishioners' beliefs: “do not wish to take possession of something else illegally, but believe in God, try to acquire what you need with the labor of your hands and peaceful conditions with the owners” (Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam, 1862, pp. 400–402). And in general, the reform implementation was presented as great mercy: “Think what is not only the truth, but also the mercy that you are offered to acquire in the permanent ownership of land known to you, to acquire legally, or for your work in for the benefit of the owner or for a reasonable price, at the payment of which the government itself is ready to help you. It is true mercy” (Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam, 1862, p. 402). It should be noted that particular attention in the “A word...” was paid to the peasantry persuasion concerning the adoption of the charter, because “all this is for their benefit”. The priests also had to emphasize to the congregation not to heed all sorts of rumors and “not to listen to people not from the government” (Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam, 1862, pp. 403–404).

Sent by Kyiv Governor-General to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, “A word to the temporarily obliged peasants” made a positive impression on P. Valuyev. Hence, numerous copies were sent to all governors, as the Minister considered it “useful to spread this

“A word...” among the peasants” and offered to publish it in the provincial information, because according to P. Valuyev it was “remarkable in terms of fidelity to the subject and clarity of the statement” (Poyda, 1960, p. 81).

According to D. Poyda, “A word to the temporarily obliged peasants” was a convincing argument in favor of the thesis of close cooperation between the government and the Orthodox Church during the main principles of the peasant reform implementation in 1861 (Poyda, 1983, pp. 130–135).

But despite the central and eparchial administrations’ instructions, some clergy tried to act in the peasantry interests. The priest in the village was always consulted, as he had education and was perceived as a kind of “expert”. For example, the repeated appeals of parishioners, who lived in the village Dovhenke, Uman district to the local priest Marakhovskyy, he advised “do not put crosses” under the charter, as there was no reliable information, and ask the peasants from other villages and provinces (CSHAK, f. 442, d. 300, c. 142, p. 198).

The Conclusions. Taking everything into consideration, the Orthodox Church, had at that time great influence on the public opinion formation, especially the peasantry. Hence, the Orthodox Church was involved actively by the authorities in order to support ideologically during the reform. The clergy’s peacekeeping activities in the context of a “correct” understanding of agrarian transformation were clearly regulated by the instructions of the central church and eparchial administrations. The clergy were obliged to form in the faithful the idea of the Tsar’s decisive role in the reform’s preparation and implementation, to present it as the Emperor’s care and mercy, to call for tolerance and anticipation of change for the better, to influence the peasants to fulfill their obligations loyal sentiments. And, of course, to fight the protest mood, because the clergy had to make every effort to avoid peasant unrest. The Orthodox Church, as part of the state apparatus, was quite successful in carrying out the tasks of approving and blessing the peasant reform, which the authorities so demanded of it.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to the staff of the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv for their help in forming the source base of this study.

Financing. The authors received no financial support for the research and publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baran, V. P., Boriak, H. V., Butych, M. I., Humeniuk, Ye. M., Demchenko, L. Ya., Naidenko, P. P. etc. (Comps.). (1988). *Selianskiy rukh na Ukraini 1850 – 1861 rr.: zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv [Peasant movement in Ukraine in 1850 – 1861: collection of documents and materials]*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 448 p. [in Ukrainian]

Blagodarnoe chuvstvo. (1861). Blagodarnoe chuvstvo krestyan Kievskoy gubernii, po obyavlenii im manifesta 19 fevralya, 1861 goda. [Grateful feeling of the peasants of the Kyiv province after the announcement of the manifesto to them on the 19th of February in 1861]. *Kievskie eparkhialnye vedomosti – Kiev diocesan news*, 12, 386–389. [in Russian]

Khytrovska, Yu. V. (2017). Hromadska dumka shchodo stanovyscha RPTs ta vplyviv pravoslavnoho dukhoventsva na naselennia Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy naprykintsi XIX – na pochatku XX st. (kriz pryzmu publikatsii pravoslavnoi presy) [Public Opinion About Russian Orthodox Church and Its Clergy’s Influence on Population in the Right-Bank Ukraine During Late 19th – Early 20th Cent. (Through the Prism of the Orthodox Press)]. *Storinky istorii: zbirnyk naukovykh prats – History pages: collection of scientific works*, 45, 19–28. doi: 10.20535/2307-5244.45.2017.117189 [in Ukrainian]

Korotkova, O. (2019). Antagonist tendencies in the relationship between the Clergy and the Ukrainian peasants in the XIX – beginning of the XX century. *Skhidnoevropeiskyyi istorychnyy visnyk – East European Historical Bulletin*, 10, 27–33. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.10.159176 [in English]

Kuznets, T. V. (2008). Vidmina kriposnoho prava i pozytsiia pravoslavnoi tserkvy na prykladi Umanskoho povitu Kyivskoi hubernii [Abolition of serfdom and the Orthodox Church attitude presented on the example of Uman district, Kyiv province]. *Hileia (naukovyi visnyk) – Hileya (scientific bulletin)*, 12, 15–21. [in Ukrainian].

Matveeva, Ye. S. (2013). Osobennosti vzaimodeystviya svetskoy i dukhovnoy vlasti v period provedeniya krestyanskoj reformy v Rossii (na materialakh Orlovskoy gubernii) [The peculiarities of secular and church authorities' interaction during the peasant reform in Russia (based on the materials from Oryol province)]. *Kontsept – Concept*, 7, 1–9. URL: <https://e-koncept.ru/2013/13143.htm> [in Russian]

Mokshina, Ye. N. (2011). Rol Russkoj pravoslavnoj tserkvy v podgotovke i provedenii krestyanskoj reformy 1861 g. v Rossii [The role of Russian Orthodox Church in the preparation and implementation of the peasant reform of 1861 in Russia]. *Sotsialno-politicheskie nauki – Socio-political sciences*, 1, 170–173. [in Russian]

Neskolko slov. (1861). Neskolko slov po povodu obnarodovaniya vysochayshego manifesta ob osvobozhdenii krestyan ot krepostnoj zavisimosti [A few words on the promulgation of the emperor's manifesto on the emancipation of peasants from serfdom]. *Rukovodstvo dlya selskikh pastyrey – Rural Shepherds Guide*, 15, 383–386. [in Russian]

Pererva, V. S. (2008). Reforma 19 liutoho 1861 r. ta tserkovne zhyttia pravoberezhnykh yeparkhii Ukrainy [The reform of the 19th of February, 1861 and church life of Right-bank Ukraine's dioceses]. *Visnyk Kam'ianets-Podilskoho universytetu imeni Ivana Ohiiienka. Istorychni nauky – Bulletin of Ivan Ohiiienko University of Kamianets-Podilskyi. Historical sciences*, 5, 152–160. [in Ukrainian]

Poyda, D. P. (1960). *Krestyanskoe dvizhenie na Pravoberezhnoj Ukraine v poreformennyj period (1866 – 1900 gg.)* [Peasant movement in Right-bank Ukraine during the post-reform period (1866 – 1900)]. Dnepropetrovsk: Dnepropetrovskoe obl. izd-vo, 488 p. [in Russian]

Poyda, D. P. (1962). Borba krestyan Pravoberezhnoj Ukrainy protiv dukhovenstva v poreformennyj period (1861 – 1900 gg.) [The struggle of Right-bank Ukraine's peasants against the clergy during the post-reform period (1861 – 1900)]. *Voprosy istorii religii i ateizma – Questions of the history of religion and atheism*, 10, 113–127. [in Russian]

Poyda, D. P. (1983). Dokument ob antinarodnoy roli dukhovenstva v period provedeniya reformy 1861 goda [The document on the clergy's antinational role during the reform implementation in 1861]. *Istoriograficheskie i istochnikovedcheskie problemy otechestvennoj istorii. Istochniki po sotsialno-ekonomicheskoy istorii Rossii i Ukrainy XVII – XIX vekov – Historiographical and source problems of national history. Sources on socio-economic history of Russia and Ukraine of the XVII – XIX centuries* (pp. 130–135). Dnepropetrovsk. [in Russian]

Reient, O. P. (2011). Do problemy skasuvannia kriposnoho prava v 1861 r. [Concerning the abolition of serfdom in 1861]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal – Ukrainian historical journal*, 1, 34–51. [in Ukrainian]

Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam. (1862). Slovo k vremenno-obyazannym krestyanam [A word to temporarily obligated peasants]. *Kievskie eparkhialnye vedomosti – Kiev diocesan news*, 12, 399–404. [in Russian]

Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Kyiv [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv – CSHAK]

Yeparkhialnaya khronika. (1861). Yeparkhialnaya khronika [Diocesan chronicle]. *Kievskie eparkhialnye vedomosti – Kiev diocesan news*, 3, 95–100. [in Russian]

*The article was received on February 13, 2020.
Article recommended for publishing 17/02/2021.*