

UDC 27-274-45(477)“17/18”  
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.19.233802

**Olena BORODENKO**

*PhD hab. (History) Associate Professor of the Department of History of Ukraine, Poltava V. H. Korolenko National Pedagogical University, 2, M. Ostrogradski Street, Poltava, Ukraine, postal code 36000 (elena\_bs@ukr.net)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0002-0292-9310

**ResearcherID:** AAL-7665-2021

**Scopus-Author ID:** 57220862661

**Roman SITARCHUK**

*PhD hab. (History) Professor, First Vice-Rector, Poltava V. H. Korolenko National Pedagogical University, 2, M. Ostrogradski Street, Poltava, Ukraine, postal code 36000 (allmail@pnpu.edu.ua)*

**ORCID:** 0000-0003-0280-6844

**Олена БОРОДЕНКО**

*докторка історичних наук, доцентка кафедри історії України Полтавського національного педагогічного університету ім. В. Г. Короленка, вул. М. Остроградського, 2, м. Полтава, Україна, індекс 36000 (elena\_bs@ukr.net)*

**Роман СІТАРЧУК**

*доктор історичних наук, професор, перший проректор Полтавського національного педагогічного університету ім. В. Г. Короленка, вул. М. Остроградського, 2, м. Полтава, Україна, індекс 36000 (allmail@pnpu.edu.ua)*

**Bibliographic Description of the Article:** Borodenko, O., & Sitarchuk, R. (2021). Orthodox parish communities as units of control over the marital mobility of the Ukrainian population of the XVIIIth – the first half of the XIXth centuries. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical bulletin]*, 19, 42–55. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.19.233802

**ORTHODOX PARISH COMMUNITIES AS UNITS OF CONTROL  
OVER THE MARITAL MOBILITY OF THE UKRAINIAN POPULATION  
OF THE XVIIIth – THE FIRST HALF OF THE XIXth CENTURIES**

**Abstract. The Purpose of the Research.** The article focuses on the issue of the territorial affiliation of people to the Orthodox parish communities; they controlled the marital mobility of the Ukrainian population of the XVIIIth – the first half of the XIXth centuries primarily to prevent illegal weddings and births. **The Methodology of the Research.** The construction of a generalized image of the Orthodox parish communities took place at the rational and emotional levels of knowledge, but at the same time based on the principle of objectivity. Interdisciplinary strategies of historical anthropology, the methods of critical, structural analysis and the method of sources deconstruction have been used. Interpretations and conclusions are based on the materials of seven archival institutions and documentation of a directive administrative, informational and publishing direction. **The Scientific Novelty.** The presentation of a new look at the Orthodox communities at the same time exposed the pressing social problems of the

period under study, some of which are relevant today: begging, profligacy, crime, illegal weddings and childbearing, infanticide, family breakdown due to the departure of one of the married couple to earn money or sale serfs and, etc. **The Conclusions.** In the XVIIIth century witness documentation was introduced, which allowed the population to migrate and get married legally. According to a civil law, the marriage registration by parishioners who were the bride or groom, was supposed to take place in the churches. People acquired membership in the new parish in the context of the issuance of the relevant permission documents in connection with the relocation, the redeployment of military units, the remoteness of the parish church from society, the unsatisfactory state of the church premises for worship, and etc. Significant factors that led to significant population movements and possible violations of matrimonial requirements were the salary movement of the common people and the flight of serfs. In the marriage case of dependent peasants of different owners and changes in the arrival of the bride-serfs, they had to submit manumission, letters of sale and purchase of peasants, or documents, which testified to releasing a person from serfdom.

**Key words:** brides, the Orthodox parish communities, testimonies, marriage, marital mobility.

### ПРАВОСЛАВНІ ПАРАФІЯЛЬНІ ГРОМАДИ ЯК ОСЕРЕДКИ КОНТРОЛЮ ЗА ШЛЮБНОЮ МОБІЛЬНІСТЮ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО НАСЕЛЕННЯ XVIII – ПЕРШОЇ ПОЛОВИНИ XIX ст.

**Анотація. Мета дослідження.** У статті порушено проблему територіальної належності людей до православних парафіяльних громад, які контролювали шлюбну мобільність українського населення XVIII – першої половини XIX ст. насамперед із метою попередження незаконних вінчань і народжень. **Методологія дослідження.** Конструювання узагальненого образу православних парафіяльних спільнот відбувалося на раціональному та чуттєвому рівнях пізнання з дотриманням принципу об'єктивності. Було використано міждисциплінарні стратегії історичної антропології, методи критичного, структурного аналізу і деконструкції джерел. Інтерпретації та висновки ґрунтуються на матеріалах восьми архівних установ і документації директивно-розпорядчого, інформаційно-публікаторського напрямку. **Наукова новизна.** Репрезентація нового погляду на православні громади одночасно викрила зловоденні суспільні проблеми досліджуваного періоду, деякі з них є актуальними й сьогодні: жебрацтво, розпуса, злочинність, незаконні вінчання й дітонародження, дітозгубництво, розпад сімей унаслідок від'їзду одного з подружньої пари на заробітки тощо. **Висновки.** У XVIII ст. впроваджувалася засвідчувальна документація, яка дозволяла населенню законно мігрувати та одружуватися. Відповідно до цивільного законодавства, реєстрація шлюбу мала відбуватися у церквах, парафіянами яких були наречена або наречений. Набуття людьми членства в новій парафії відбувалося за умов оформлення відповідних документів-дозволів у зв'язку з переїздом, передислокацією військових частин, віддаленістю парафіяльного храму від громади, незадовільним станом церковного приміщення для проведення богослужінь тощо. Вагомими чинниками, які зумовлювали значні переміщення населення та можливі порушення матримоніальних вимог, були заробітчаський рух простолюду, а також втечі кріпосних селян. Міграціями відзначалися прикордонні населені пункти. У разі одруження залежних селян різних власників і зміни парафії наречених-кріпосних зобов'язували надати причту відпускні свідоцтва, листи купівлі-продажу селян або документи-звільнення особи з-під кріпосної залежності.

**Ключові слова:** наречені, православні парафіяльні громади, свідоцтва, шлюб, шлюбна мобільність.

**The Problem Statement.** Act documents of the XVIIIth – the first half of the XIXth centuries demonstrated involuntarily the concern of the state and the church in cases of non-compliance with the matrimonial requirements determined by the Orthodox faith. Illiteracy and legal ignorance of the population, the lack of an effective system of documentary register of persons caused uncontrolled movement of people and change of a permanent residence. Sometimes, while migrating, married individuals formed a new family

union. The legal validity of the previous marriage did not cease, which was contrary to the civil law (Borodenko, 2020; PSZRI, 1830c, p. 42; PSZRI, 1830e, p. 654; PSZRI, 1830i, pp. 1180–1181; PSZRI, 1830k, p. 352; Svod zakonov, 1832, p. 18).

To prevent illegal weddings in “Instructions to the Elders” No. 1612 of December 26, 1697, the Charter of the Spiritual College of January 25, 1721, May appendix to it of 1722 and the Synodal decree of August 5, 1775 emphasized the need for conducting the sacrament of marriage in those parishes where the bride or groom lived (PSZRI, 1830a, p. 422; PSZRI, 1830b, pp. 343, 707; PSZRI, 1830f, p. 197). In particular, Paragraph 12 of the Charter of the Spiritual College of 1721 emphasized the following: “however, it is not appropriate to marry in another parish, in which neither the bridegroom lives nor the bride; one should not to get married in another Episcopia. Not to call also priests from another parish or the Diocese for a wedding; because this, besides the reproaches of priests from native parishes, looks like the married couple is under suspicion of a wrong marriage essence” (PSZRI, 1830b, p. 343).

Marriage in non-native churches was permitted, but on condition that a passport or certificate of birth and marital status of the person who wished to marry was presented to a representative of the parish clergy. Otherwise, marriages without the consent of the priests of the native parishes were considered doubtful, and children born had to be recorded as illegitimate ones (Novyy klass, 1878, pp. 1143–1144). Statistics data calculated from church records show that marriages usually took place in the parish churches of the bride (Borodenko, 2018, p. 69).

**The purpose** of the research is the formation of a generalized image of the Orthodox parish communities, which performed the function of control over the marital mobility of the Ukrainian population in the XVIIIth – the first half of the XIXth centuries. The creation of such an intellectual product in the modern space of socio-cultural knowledge aims at understanding, comprehending and representing a new view on the Orthodox communities as territorial centers of parishioners, in which newly introduced certification documents about people were tested at the state level. Owing to newly introduced certification documents, the institution of citizenship, the legal basis of the family, control over displacement, place of residence and marital status of people were established, illegal marriages and violations of the Christian morality were prevented.

**The Scientific Novelty.** The imaginary portrait of the Orthodox parish communities makes it possible to reveal a number of acute social problems of that period of time, a significant part of which remains relevant nowadays. The historical reconstruction of the past is based on a two-level principle of acquiring new knowledge. Within a rational level of cognition there was the study of sources, the identification of such factual material that would create conditions for a certain field of interpretations and conclusions. Another sensory level allowed us to imagine the peculiarities of an everyday life of different segments representatives of the population, to perceive human vices critically, to find out the importance of a prayer for the military, to show their family conflicts, on the example of the churches of Chernihiv to feel the atmosphere of liturgy among the military, etc. Adherence to the principle of objectivity was reflected in the disclosure of this problem with the maximum avoidance of the authors’ personal worldviews.

**The methodology** of the intellectual product is based on an interdisciplinary research strategies of “a human science”, because the issues of social anthropology (a normative and deviant behaviour, customs and rights as a social regulator, crime and forms of violence, marginal social groups – thieves, prostitutes, beggars, etc.), socio-religious history (religious discipline of the society, forms and manifestations of piety, etc.), stories of an

everyday life (a private life of families, etc.). The use of methods of critical, structural analysis and deconstruction of sources made it possible not to take everything stated in the documents literally, because “inaccurate information” may be due to the very nature of a human reception, instead, to separate the necessary facts from the written texts and to overcome “naive historicism”, i.e. a straightforward understanding of what was written (Yakovenko, 2007, pp. 211, 235, 243, 244).

**The source base of the research** is based on the materials of eight archival institutions: State Archives of Vinnytsia, Kyiv, Poltava, Sumy, Chernihiv, Kharkiv, Khmelnytsky regions and the Institute of Manuscripts of the National Library of Ukraine named after V. I. Vernadsky. The formulated problem necessitated the study of the court cases of county courts, church statistical books, documentation of clerical departments, certifying documents of individuals, etc. In addition, a directive and administrative documentation (decrees, civil legislation) and the information and publication “Poltava Diocesan Information” were included into the study. These sources are differentiated according to the conditional classification made in the collection “Business Documentation of the Hetmanate of the XVIIIth century” (Dubrovina, 1993, p. 32).

The study of a large array of sources made it possible to implement the following tasks: to study the system of control over the affiliation of people to a particular parish; to identify the reasons for the introduction of the necessary control over migration processes; to reconstruct possible ways to change the membership of the parish and draw up the necessary documentation; to single out factors, which caused the migration of the population and gave rise to violations of matrimonial requirements; to analyze the permit documentation from the landlords for the relocation and marriage of serfs; to point at antisocial manifestations of a human behaviour; to distinguish individual problems of the society, etc. At the same time, we are aware of the need for a careful interpretation of behaviour, urgent human affairs, because what is considered to be a standard behavioral manifestation for today may not have been characteristic of the people of that period of time.

**The Analysis of Researches and Publications.** The authors analyzed the works of the following researchers on some issues of the outlined problem: American researcher Michelle Lamarche Marreze – a legal status of the female nobles of imperial Russia (Marreze, 2009); Italian researcher Massimo Livi Bachchi – migration processes in Europe (Livi Bachchi, Massimo, 2010); Polish researcher Mateusz Wyżga – a rural family in the parish of Raciborowice near Kraków (Wyżga, 2009); Polish researcher Maria Sierocka-Pośpiech – marriage market in Warsaw in the XVIIth century (Sierocka-Pośpiech, 2009); Polish researcher Katarzyna Sulej – premarital relations of Polish magnate families of the XVIth – the XVIIIth centuries (Sulej, 2009); Ukrainian researcher Iryna Petrenko – marital relations in the daily life of the people in the lands of the Russian Empire in the XVIIIth century (Petrenko, 2010).

**The Main Material Statement.** Control over the affiliation of people to a particular parish was performed by the representatives of the parish clergy. They were one of the few educated members of the community who performed law enforcement functions, recorded information about parishioners in church statistics books, identified missing and newly arrived persons, and etc. Parishioners elected church elders for three years to help a priest and with his consent among the people of “a pious life and honest rules” (PSZRI, 1842, p. 234).

However, the parish clergy sometimes committed wrongdoings because they checked all marriage requirements and married people from other parishes inadvertently. Priests were to be prosecuted for violating executive discipline. This happened when colleagues, relatives or acquaintances of already married people complained about the illegal actions

of a priest. Complaints of members of the parish clergy can be found in the court cases of Slobidska Ukraine. Thus, in January report of 1773 written by the priest of Kropyventsi village, the priest Hryhorovych was accused of conducting church marriage ceremony to Pelahia Chernenkova, a resident of the neighbouring parish (State Archives of Sumy region, f. 960, d. 2, c. 1017).

In another court case of 1774 – 1775 – the case of a non-native resident Ivon Shemian, whose illegal church marriage ceremony was conducted by the representatives of the parish clergy of Ovlashi village: the priest Zubov and deacon Danylov (SASR, f. 960, d. 2, c. 1115). In March-April of 1766, on the denunciation of the priest of Pyriatyn Yakubovsky against his successor Pavlo Sukhodolsky, the court case on the illegal marriage of Paraskeva Holovnykha, a widow, a member of another parish, was considered. It turned out that the woman was not a widow but a married woman, but she did not have any official documents. However, the priest did not demand a certificate from the metric book, but believed the person's word and thus performed the wedding ceremony illegally (State Archives of Poltava region, f. 801, d. 1, c. 133).

In the first half of the XVIIIth century certification of the population “in the form of a document” in the context of the unification of office work in the Russian Empire provided for the issuance of certificates from metric books, marriage searches or confessional signatures, but most likely there was no obligation for such documents, and certificates were issued on request (Borodenko, 2019a, pp. 8–15). It is possible that uneducated people did not attach importance to the documents and did not preserve them.

In order to control the migration movement of the population, the recognition of newborns as legal, the gradual enslavement of peasants, the registration of conscripts and the prevention of illegal marriages, the practice of assigning people to parishes of individual churches became widespread. Even the inhabitants of the local diocese were admitted to monasticism. The villagers were asked about the virtue of a person who wants to be secluded from a worldly life: a marital status, age, criminal record / no criminal record, absence / presence of debts and serfdom, etc. (PSZRI, 1830b, p. 708). Divorce proceedings were also conducted within the dioceses where the plaintiffs lived (PSZRI, 1842, p. 250).

The procedure for registering people's place of residence was quite complicated. Let us try to reconstruct the acquisition by the population of a certain community registered membership of the Orthodox laity. Let's analyze the documentation of spiritual consistories or boards on specific examples. Thus, a retired cornet Lytvynov bought a house in Brovary and decided to move with his family from Kyiv. To move to Brovary the man sent a letter dated on May 11, 1807, to His Eminence asking him to include his family into the list of parishioners of the Trinity Church in Brovary because of the move. Two months later, on August 8, 1807, Kozelets Spiritual Board of Chernihiv Consistory reported receiving an imperial majesty's decree granting the cornet's request (State Archives of Chernigiv region, f. 679, d. 2, c. 334). Another example: on March 20, 1807 the people of the village Drobyshev appealed to Chernihiv Consistory with a request to enroll local residents to the parishioners' list of Chulativka church, which was nearby territorially. The reason was the distance of 10 verstv from the Church of the Resurrection of Chernihiv, the inhabitants of the village previously belonged to (SACHR, f. 679, d. 2, c. 331).

Interesting details about the change of parish membership are revealed in the church documentation of Chernihiv Consistory during the period of 1845 – 1846. In a petition dated on November 8, 1845, by Colonel Ruberg of Charles Prussian Infantry Regiment stationed

in Chernihiv, a request was made to assign one of the city's churches to conscripts. The answer was received a few days later (on November 14). The troops of this regiment were assigned to Chernihiv Resurrection Church. But in a subsequent petition dated on November 24, the regimental commander appealed to the Consistory with another request: in view of the remoteness of the Church of the Resurrection from the location of the military unit to secure the affiliation of the military to the Church of the Intercession. On November 30, Chernihiv Consistory, arguing their decision by unsatisfactory condition of the Church of the Intercession, assigned the ranks of this regiment to St. Catherine's Church.

Almost a year later, on September 24, 1846, another commander, Major General Fedir Shcherbatsky, "humbly asked" "to provide a moral benefit to my subordinates" and to give a more advantageous location for the military unit, as in the church of St. Catherine "it is too cold and the glass in many windows is broken, so that the birds flying into the church during the service, often interfered in the reverence of the worshipers with their chirping and in unbearable winter cold to make soldiers, burdened with the work of the service, address the earthly and forget a prayer". On September 27, 1846, in order to protect the military from catching a cold, Major General addressed the Vice-Governor of Chernihiv Province with a request to allocate the premises of Chernihiv City Duma for the regimental church, where services were held for the Lutherans and Catholics. Apparently on October 4 – 6, the warmest temperature was in Peter and Paul Cemetery Church, which was located outside the city and became a regimental church (SACHR, f. 679, d. 2, c. 4676, pp. 1–11).

The registration and mobile campaign to secure the soldiers of Charles Prussian Infantry Regiment in individual churches in Chernihiv lasted for almost a year. Commanders in search of a warm church addressed petitions to both the spiritual consistory and the provincial leadership. We understand that during this time the records of military parishioners in the church books could change and be lost sometimes. It is likely that data on the marital status of conscripts were lost, so if a soldier wanted to get married, there could be some difficulty with the supporting documents. The military had to be given permission by the leadership and the regimental priest, in which age and marital status were indicated (Borodenko, 2019a, p. 10).

This example demonstrated the concern of regimental commanders to create comfortable conditions for the military to hold the Orthodox services, because a prayer was important in their service life. Registration relocation of the population of certain communities from one parish to another could take place under different circumstances. Among circumstances are the following: change of permanent residence by a person or family in connection with the relocation, the military unit – redeployment; a territorial distance of parishioners from the church in the presence of another, closer, much more comfortable church; unsatisfactory conditions for worship in the church, etc.

To obtain documents for the transfer of the Orthodox laity from one parish to another at least permission from the clerical boards and consistories, in some cases from the provincial or city administration, but most from the Imperial Majesty, was required. In addition, servicemen, who decided to marry, had to provide permission from their commanders, regimental priests with extracts from church statistics books on marital status. The instructions gave the right to the field priest to marry only regimental soldiers, having previously conducted a premarital inquiry into the presence of living or dead wives from previous marriage (PSZRI, 1830g, p. 701).

In the confessional records of different villages, newcomers were marked differently. Border settlements were especially distinguished. In particular, the town of Zbryzh, Kamenets County, Podil Province, was noted for its border location, as it was located on the Zbruch

River, a natural borderline between the Right Bank, which in 1793 after the second division of the Commonwealth started to belong to the Russian Empire, and Eastern Galicia, which became the part of the Austrian Empire. During the period of 1801 and 1819 Zbryzhansk confessional records of the Trinity and St. Michael's Orthodox Churches indicated briefly the forms of registration of migrants and migratory movements of the population due to various circumstances (State Archives of Khmelnytsky region, f. 315, d. 1, c. 6795, pp. 129–142; f. 315, d. 1, c. 7059, pp. 337–350).

Firstly, a separate, most numerous category of parishioners, in addition to the clergy and nobles, were “settlers and their housemates”, who mostly appeared with surnames of clearly Russian or Left Bank Ukrainian origin: Velychko, Hovorukha, Kovaliov, Povoroznikov, Losiatsky, Zhukovsky, etc. We assume that the south-western borders of the Russian Empire were strengthened by the settlers. In the confessional records of the only Holy Dormition Orthodox Church of 1868 and 1875 there were clearly distinguished the categories of “the military and their family members” and “the border guard” in the structure of the population of the town (SAKhmR, f. 315, d. 1, c. 8817, pp. 1026–1044; f. 315, d. 1, c. 11908, pp. 673–690).

Secondly, there were moved people from abroad. Those were recruited workers, who were registered the following way: “Hryhoriy Stepankov, a worker who came from Galicia”, “Vasyliy Vasyliiev Zamrykot who came from Galicia, a worker”. Other notes indicated the absence of individual parishioners during Holy Pentecost. In particular, Ivan Stepankov Lazurkevych, who went to Galicia, is mentioned in the church register of 1801 without the specified number of years he lived (SAKhmR, f. 315, d. 1, c. 6795, pp. 132, 137, 139). Tymofiy Petrovych Sitarchuk, who is recorded in the confessional records of 1868 of the Roman Catholic religion, without a wife, but at the same time not in the status of a widower, with three children “were not present” in the church (SAKhmR, f. 315, d. 1, c. 8817, p. 1037). We should suppose that the absence of Tymofiy and his children in Zbryzh could be caused by his move in search of earnings, his marriage or relocation.

Thirdly, sometimes in Zbryzhansk registers there were recorded marriages with foreigners. Apparently, the newly formed family of 20-year-old Pelahia, who is registered in the confessional book of 1801 as “married to a Pole”, although the groom's surname is not recorded, she did not make a decision on her permanent residence after the wedding. The woman continued to live in the household of 44-year-old father Andriy Fedorov Pykha and 35-year-old Sofia Stepanova (SAKhmR, f. 315, d. 1, c. 6795, p. 141). Thus, the analysis of the registration records of confessional books in Zbryzh presented certain data on population migrations, which were primarily related to labour searches or marriages. Border settlements were especially distinguished by various manifestations of population movements.

Like the military, serfs had to present marriage certificates from their owners or landlords (Borodenko, 2019b, pp. 48–50). In the divorce proceedings of serfs there was the same situation. Giving letters of permission created certain problems for landlords and made it almost impossible to file for divorce by serfs in court. In the case of the move of serfs from their native parish, they had to have “a ticket” from the owner for free move, a sale or buy letter or leave certificate “free”. Such document dated on April 11, 1800, was provided by a landlady, Countess Daelowska of Kyiv Province, to her serfs, whom she released to earn money. By the way, the document for a free move was intended for a small group of labourers and was written in Latvian (State Archives of Kyiv region, f. 227, d. 1, c. 207, pp. 1–2). On April 7, 1847, the widow of the ponomar Pelahia of Chernihiv requested the issuance of a permit-ticket for a free move to Kyiv (State Archives of Kharkiv region, f. 40, d. 35, c. 170).

A long absence of a husband was often the cause of a family relationship break off. The court case of 1766 represents the history of the Cossack Danylo Kyrenko from the village of Yatsyny. Six-year absence of the husband-labourer led to the lewd behaviour of his wife Melania Ivanovna. The woman lived a promiscuous life with her husband's brother Timothy and several men from whom children were born: some were dead, the others were considered to have died quickly. After deceiving the priest, Melania married Kravets, a neighbour, because she said she was a widow (SAPR, f. 801, d. 1, c. 132).

In another situation, the wife spent six years abroad, at the Polish territory. She was engaged to a new husband allegedly. Meanwhile, in 1776, a legitimate husband Shapoval decided to remarry, but the priest Olshansky refused to conduct a marriage ceremony (SAPR, f. 801, d. 1, c. 510). In 1789 Yevdokiya Lavrynenko appealed to Pyriatyn Spiritual Board with a petition for divorce. The reason was the ten-year absence of the husband-labourer, after all the husband didn't send any information about himself (SAPR, f. 801, d. 1, c. 1014). In 1774 Theodosia Koloshko asked for permission for a new marriage, because for seven years her husband "went to the villages and nothing was known about him" and he did not come back (SAPR, f. 801, d. 1, c. 386). Civil law allowed to divorce on condition of the sixth year of the absence of one of the spouses (PSZRI, 1830j, p. 363).

Thus, the absence of labourers for five years, their illiteracy, distance from their families, communication with the family only by means of sending them presents or verbal greetings by acquaintances of parishioners could lead to a family break off, deviant behaviour of married couples, illegal marriages and even child-killing. During the second half of the XVIIIth century such families were apparently not allowed to be divorced, as the labourers were not found dead. It was illegal to enter into another family union for a person whose spouse was alive. Only at the beginning of the XIXth century decrees appeared that eased divorce conditions. Regulatory documents of the Synod of February 28, 1806, on September 25, 1810 defined the procedure for filing for divorce clearly: if within five years the family member did not appear, the other representative of the couple had every reason to start the divorce process. The military person was obliged to show a marriage permit from the head of the military unit, and the serf – from the landlord (PSZRI, 1830i, p. 106–107; PSZRI, 1830j, p. 363).

In some cases people with false certificates or without identification documents were revealed. Those were the fugitives or the homeless. In the middle of the XIXth century in the county courts of Podilsk province there were lawsuits about the validity of rights of individuals to the place of residence. Those were Anton, Evdokia and Marfa Voynarovsky, Semen and Ivan Strelbytsky and the others (State Archives of Vinnitsa region, f. 468, d. 1, c. 903; f. 468, d. 1, c. 939; f. 468, d. 1, c. 940; f. 473, d. 1, c. 89). Loss of passports, documents for real estate ownership by people from different social classes could create another social problem – the emergence of marginal elements, beggars, the homeless. Thus, on the crossing of the Dnieper River in May of 1834, on the way to Dnieper city, a man named Paul was stopped, had no identification documents, did not know or hid his origin. The homeless was punished with beatings and exile to Siberia (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 470, p. 1). In 1851 Pochtarenko, a fugitive peasant woman, was punished: by 50 blows with sticks and her detention in a labourer's (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 832).

In another case, in April of 1830, in Kyiv a group of people was arrested and accused of living under false documents. It turned out that they all came from different localities and differed in marital status. Among them there were both women and men, mostly of reproductive age: at the age of 25 to 50, but there was also a 65-year-old man. Among them

there were runaway women peasants from the village of Mykolayivka, Romensky district, Poltava province. The first one, 27 years old, was a serf of the landlady Paraskeva Poletyka, the other one, 34 years old, – was the landlady Maksymenkova (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 291, pp. 3, 58). In 1831, a man named Kuchynenko was detained because of the absence of a residence permit and a false certificate of a nobleman (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 311).

If a serf pretended to be a member of another social class and forged the documents and married a free person by deception, he was punished by deprivation of all estates, exile to Siberia, and beating with whips. If the wife knew of her husband's status, she was also found guilty and punished by being sent to a brothel for one to two years (PSZRI, 1846, p. 969).

The above mentioned documentation demonstrated a significant migration of the working population to Kyiv in search of work. In addition, it was quite ordinary for the common people to present false documents. In 1763, in large cities it was offered to accept beggars, soldiers, sailors and recruits, the elderly and the disabled in the almshouse with passports, and in case of passports absence to inspect the newcomers (PSZRI, 1830d, p. 175). A special provision of the Committee of Ministers of April 23, 1840, in Kyiv imposed fines for non-disclosure by the police the information about newcomers, visitors and those leaving the city (PSZRI, 1841, p. 301).

Another document that determined the fate of serfs and changed their place of residence was a purchase agreement document. At least at the end of the XVIIIth century such documents were concluded between the landlords as a result of arrangements on sheets of paper with a seal at the cost of 4 kopicks. For example, on May 4, 1784, a similar purchase agreement was concluded between Yelyzaveta Matviyeva, the wife of the retired life guards corporal Petro Ivanovych Lomanov from the village of Ivashev in Tver governorate, and Lieutenant Andriy Semenovych Lytvynov from the “village of Kiyevo”. The reason for concluding the document was the marriage of the serf girl of the landlady Martha Vasylyeva to the serf Kuzma Andriyev of the mentioned above owner. For the serf girl, who married and moved to live in the estate of the new owner, Yelyzaveta Lomanova received 40 rubles. The certificate was written by Tver provincial postman, “a serf affairs writer” Havrylo Verevnin, the landlady only signed it (The Institute of Manuscripts of the The National Library of Ukraine named after VI Vernadsky, f. 53, c. 307). It is noticeable that the serf trade took place not only in a certain province, but also outside it. In some cases, the Ukrainian serfs peasants married the Russian ones.

At the end of the XVIIIth century in Kyiv province, the cost of serf girls who were sold to other owners as a result of marriage or other circumstances ranged from 20 to 80 rubles (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 78; f. 227, d. 1, c. 81). In the materials of the journal of Kyiv County Court dated on July 14, 1787, a record was found, as well as a copy of the letter about the purchase of the serf girl Natalia Sevastianova by Lieutenant Pylyp Tarakanov from the secretary Stepan Polenets at the price of 80 rubles (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 88). Men were probably valued a little more. Purchase deals, at least we found out, started from 25 rubles (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 79). Much higher was the price for the sale of a serf Andreyev, for whom Ensign Mykhailov asked 102 rubles (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 198). With such documents, serfs changed their place of residence and became a part of a new parish. Quite often the reason for the sale of serfs was their marriage to serfs peasants of other owners. The serf trade destroyed their families. By Decree of February 19, 1841, the Senate sought to solve an urgent social problem. The act was aimed at preserving families, as it forbade the sale of serfs separately from their families, and in the case of purchase and sale it was emphasized

the registration of dependent peasants in the estates of new owners and, accordingly, in other parish communities. (PSZRI, 1842, p. 15).

There were also situations when serfs married without the permission of the landlord or the manager of the property. We found out about one of these couples from the case of Starodub County Court of Chernihiv Province. On January 25, 1810 a priest from the village of Luchkovych of Starodub County, Ioann Shermerevych conducted a church marriage ceremony of a serf woman from the village of Nestruev, Paraskeva Chemerysova and a Cossack from the village of Pechenyky Yefym Rubtsov. The priest conducted the ceremony without the permission of the managing housekeeper, because the landowner, colonel and cavalier Budlensky was in St. Petersburg at that time. The trial lasted from February 17 to November 15, 1810. The verdict was the following: the newly formed family should not be separated, and the pastors should not continue to perform the wedding ceremony without a letter of permission from the landlord or his proxy (SACHR, f. 676, d. 2, c. 469). A similar court case is found in the archives of Olhopol County Court of Podilsk Province during the period of 1844 – 1854. The court case concerned a serf Evdokiya Polishchuk, who also married without permission from the landlord (SAVR, f. 468, d. 1, c. 748).

Those serfs who received certificates “at large” were the happiest. They became free and mobile people because they could change their place of residence at will. In matrimonial documents, they were registered mainly as follows: “released”, “at large” or “released and not yet assigned to any social class” (SASR, f. 834, d. 2, c. 4, pp. 20, 32, 81; f. 844, d. 1, c. 3, p. 62; f. 844, d. 1, c. 6, p. 64; f. 855, d. 1, c. 41, pp. 77–78; f. 1187, d. 1, c. 10, p. 177). In addition, it should be noted that in this status there were women mostly. The document which certified liberation from serfdom was mostly written on sheets of paper with a seal. The price of such certificate varied depending on the period of time. In particular, one of these letters with the stamp of 1795 cost 10 rubles. There is depicted an appeal to the Emperor Pavel Petrovych, dated on February 26, 1797, from Moscow landlady Oryna Ivanivna Marmion with a request to certify the document “at large” of her serf. On August 26, 1787, the noblewoman bought a serf girl, Anna Mykhailova, from the state adviser, senator, cavalier, Prince Petro Mykhailovych Volkonsky. During the years, the woman served decently and devotedly, that is why, the landlady decided to express some gratitude and release Anna Mykhailova to eternal freedom. A certificate was attached to this appeal (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 189).

In the example given, the landlady gave her serf freedom on her own initiative, but there were situations when outsiders not landladies themselves appealed to judicial or local authorities to grant freedom to serfs who suffered humiliation and violence from their masters. On June 4, 1829, bourgeois neighbours from Kyiv appealed to Kyiv governor Vasyl Semenovych Katerynych to release a serf girl, Tetiana Fomina Zelenska because of the abuse by her burgher-owner, Ahafia Sytnikova (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 300). The same case took place during 1824 – 1825, bourgeois neighbours asked for a serf, Pavlovska who belonged to the landowner, Captain Kyrta (SAKR, f. 227, d. 1, c. 243).

Despite the patriarchal paternalistic nature of the society, some decrees of the XVIIIth century – the first half of the XIXth century defended the serfs. At the end of the XVIIIth century women nobles accused of using a physical torture against serfs were sent to convents (Marreze, 2009, p. 302). On April 4, 1802 a landowner Major Orlov was sent to the monastery for ten years for inhuman treatment of his peasants (PSZRI, 1830h, p. 90). In 1839, measures were taken to prosecute the white and black clergy of the Roman Catholic Church, who abused the “fundushev” population, especially peasants and servants

(PSZRI, 1840, p. 70). Thus, having received the document “at large” from a landowner, serfs peasants received personal freedoms, perhaps, the most important of which was the freedom to choose a matrimonial partner. Some serfs were lucky: outsiders, protecting them from a landowner violence, sought a court decision to release them from serfdom.

**The Conclusions.** The study allowed us to draw the following conclusions. Firstly, a number of decrees of the early XVIIIth century demonstrated concern about the violation of matrimonial requirements by the population and regulated weddings in those churches whose parishioners were the brides.

Secondly, there are noticeable attempts to form the institution of citizenship at the national level by the certification of the population issuing supporting documents: passports, certificates, certificates extracted from the metric, church search books, confession books and records.

Thirdly, the act documentation demonstrated the need to introduce control over the migration processes of the population, primarily, in order to prevent illegal marriages and the childbirth in invalid family unions.

Fourthly, the change of parish membership was mainly due to the relocation of a person or family due to marriage, employment, move, relocation of the military unit, territorial distance from the community church, when there was a closer and more convenient church, unsatisfactory conditions for conducting services in the church, etc. Border settlements were in a special situation, where migration movements were of both internal and interstate importance. For parishioners to move from one Orthodox community to another, documents were required with the permission of clerical boards or consistories, the provincial or city administration, and sometimes even Imperial Majesty.

Fifthly, serfs, before marrying or divorcing, showed permission from the landlord or his trustee. Serf brides, when moving to other local communities, had to present to the priest a certificate of leave, documents of sale or release from serfdom. Buying and selling serfs sometimes ruined their families. This painful public issue the authorities tried to resolve by the decree of 1841.

Sixthly, move of population and violations of matrimonial requirements were caused by leaving for earnings and the run away of serfs.

Seventhly, the uncontrolled mobility of the population could give rise to antisocial manifestations of the population: forgery of documents, violence of landlords against serfs, run away of serfs peasants, illegal weddings ceremonies without leave documents from landlords, infanticide, and etc.

Eighthly, important factors in maintaining the fighting spirit of conscripts were the Christian discipline, the creation of comfortable conditions in regimental churches. The military, before getting married, had to present a permit-certificate from the regimental commanders.

Ninthly, the loss of control of the Orthodox communities over the fate of their parishioners could be accompanied by the marginalization of individuals, i.e., their transformation into beggars, criminals, prostitutes, and etc. Owing to the religious discipline of the population by the observance of the Christian morality, especially marriage, and legislative levers, the state tried to establish the legal basis of the family, prevent crime, determine punishment for offenders, establish citizenship, and etc. Persons who committed lawlessness in compliance with the matrimonial requirements set by the Orthodox doctrine and the state laws, thus demonstrated a decrease in the level of piety, obedience to the law and responsibility of long-accepted in the society with Christian ethical, customary norms.

The prospect of our research consists in continuing the study of matrimonial family relations of the Orthodox Ukrainian population of the XVIIIth – the first half of the XIXth century: to study divorce requirements, illegal family formations, etc., in details.

**Funding.** The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

**Borodenko, O.** (2018). Istoryko-demografichna kharakterystyka shliubiv silskoho naselennia pershoi polovyny XIX st. (na prykladi sil Romenskoho povitu Poltavskoi hubernii) [Marital Cohort of the Rural Population of the First Half of the 19th Century: Historical and Demographic Characteristics (On the Example of the Villages of Romny District, Poltava Province)]. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. Seriya: Istoriia – Scientific Issues Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University. Series: History, 2 (II)*, 68–72. [in Ukrainian]

**Borodenko, O.** (2019). Pidhotovka do obriadu vinchannia u XVIII – pershii polovyny XIX st. (na osnovi materialiv dozvilnoi dokumentatsii) [Preparations for the Wedding Ceremony in the 18th – the First Half of the 19th Century (on the basis of resolving documentation)]. *Ukrainske relihiieznavstvo – Ukrainian Religious Studies*. 87. pp. 38–54. doi: 10.32420/2019.87.1315 [in Ukrainian]

**Borodenko, O.** (2019a). Dokumenty-dozvoly na shliub XVIII – pershoi polovyny XIX stolit: sprobna analizu [Resolving Documents For Marriage of the 18<sup>th</sup> – the First Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries: An Attempt to Analyze]. *Istorychna pam'iat – Historical memory, 40 (1)*, 8–14. [in Ukrainian]

**Borodenko, O., & Sharavara, T., & Walancik-Ryba, K.** (2020). Illegal Marriages: Violation of the Matrimonial Requirements by the Ukrainian Orthodox Population during the XVIIIth – the First Half of the XIXth Centuries. *Skhidnoievropeyskyi istorychnyi visnyk – East european Historical bulletin, 16*, 17–28. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.16.210880 [in Ukrainian]

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Chernihivskoi oblasti (State Archives of Chernigiv region – SACHR)*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kharkivskoi oblasti (State Archives of Kharkiv region – SAKHR)*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Khmelnytskoi oblasti (State Archives of Khmelnytsky region – SAKHMR)*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Kyivskoi oblasti (State Archives of Kyiv region – SAKR)*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Poltavskoi oblasti (State Archives of Poltava region – SAPR)*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Sumskoi oblasti (State Archives of Sumy region – SASR)*

*Derzhavnyi arkhiv Vinnytskoi oblasti (State Archives of Vinnitsa region – SAVR)*

**Dubrovina, L. A., (Ed.), & Gorobets, V. Y., (Comps.)** (1993). *Dilova dokumentatsiia Hetmanshchyny XVIII st.: Zb. dokumentiv [Official Hetman Documentation of the 18th Century.: Collection of Documents]*. AN Ukrainy. In-t ukr. arkhieohrafii ta in.; Uporiad., avtor peredmovy ta koment. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka. [in Ukrainian]

*Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteky Ukrainy imeni V. I. Vernadskoho [The Institute of Manuscripts of the the National Library of Ukraine named after VI Vernadsky]*

**Livi Bachchi, Massimo.** (2010). *Demograficheskaya istoriya Yevropy. Seriya “Stanovlenie Yevropy”. [per. s ital. A. Mirolyubovoy]. [Demographic History of Europe. Series “Formation of Europe”. [authorized translation from Italian by N. Luzhetskoy]. SPb.: “Aleksandriya”. [in Russian]*

**Marreze, M. L.** (2009). *Babye tsarstvo: Dvoryanki i vladenye imushchestvom v Rossii (1700 – 1861). Avtorizovannyi perevod s angl. N. Luzhetskoy. [A Woman's Kingdom: Noblewomen and the control of Property in Russia (1700–1861). Authorized translation from English. by N. Luzhetskoy]. Moscow: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye. [in Russian]*

**Novyy klass.** (1878). *Novyy klass nezakonnorozhdennykh [A New Class of Illegitimates]. Poltavskiya eparkhialnyya vedomosti. Chast neoffitsialnaya – Poltava Diocese News. Unofficial part, 24, 15 dekabrya, 1143–1144. [in Russian]*

**Petrenko, I.** (2010). *Shliubno-simeini vidnosyny v povsiakdennomu zhytti myriian Rosiiskoi derzhavy XVIII st.: monohrafiia v 2 ch. [Marriage and Family Relations in the Everyday Life of the Laity of the Russian State of the XVIIIth Century: monograph in 2 parts]. Ch. I. Poltava: RVV PUET. [in Ukrainian]*

**PSZRI.** (1830a). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 3). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830b). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 6). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830c). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 7). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830d). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 16). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830e). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 19). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830f). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 20). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830g). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 24). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830h). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 27). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830i). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 29). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830j). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 31). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1830k). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie pervoye (Vol. 32). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1840). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie vtoroe (Vol. 14). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1841). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie vtoroe (Vol. 15, 1). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1842). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie vtoroe (Vol. 16, 1). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**PSZRI.** (1846). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1646 goda [The Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire since 1646]*. Sobranie vtoroe (Vol. 20, 1). Sankt-Peterburg: Tip. II Otd. Sobstvennoi E.I. V. Kantcelarii. [in Russian]

**Sierocka-Pospiech, M.** (2009). "Rynek małżeński" w Starej Warszawie w XVII wieku na podstawie rejestracji ślubów w parafii św. Jana [The "Marriage Market" in Old Warsaw during the Seventeenth Century upon the Bases of Wedding Registers in the Parish of St. John]. *Spoleczeństwo staropolskie*. T. III. [pod redakcją M. Koczyński, in.] (pp. 11–224). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DIG. [in Polish]

**Sulej, K.** (2009). Mariaże magnackie w XVI – XVIII wieku na podstawie intercyz przedślubnych [Magnate Marriages in the Sixteenth–Eighteenth Century upon the Basis of Prenuptial Contracts]. *Spoleczeństwo staropolskie*. T. III. [pod redakcją M. Koczyński, in.] (pp. 63–97). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DIG. [in Polish]

**Svod zakonov.** (1832). *Svod zakonov grazhdanskikh i mezhevykh [Code of Civil and Boundary Laws]*. Zakony Grazhdanskie. Sanktpeterburg. Pechatano v Tipografii II Otdeleniya Sobstvennoy Yego Imperatorskago Velichestva Kantselyarii. T. X. Ch. I. [in Russian]

**Wyźga, M.** (2009). Rodzina chłopska w parafii Raciborowice pod Krakowem w XVII – XVIII wieku [A Peasant Family in the Parish of Raciborowice near Cracow in the Seventeenth – the Eighteenth Century]. *Spoleczeństwo staropolskie*. T. III. [pod redakcją M. Kopczyński, in.] (pp. 245–278). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo DIG. [in Polish]

**Yakovenko, N.** (2007). *Vstup do istorii [Introduction into History]*. Kyiv: Krytyka. [in Ukrainian]

*The article was received May 17, 2020.*

*Article recommended for publishing 19/05/2021.*