

УДК (UDC) 94 (477.51) «1860/1890»

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2023.1\(41\).623](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2023.1(41).623)

THE CLERICAL POLICY OF THE ZEMSTVO LIBERAL FRONDE OF CHERNIHIV PROVINCE (1860-80S)

Nazar Kotelnytskyi

Chernihiv institute of information, Business and Law of the international Scientific and
Technical University named after academician Yu. Bugai (Chernihiv, Ukraine)

e-mail: subton7@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4480-365X>

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the research paper is to clarify the basic components of the clerical policy of the zemstvo liberal party of Chernihiv province (hubernia), which was an integral and organic part of the ethno-confessional program of that trend of the liberation movement in the Russian Empire in the second half of the 19th century.

The scientific novelty of the study is in the fact that for the first time in historical science, an attempt is made to study the fundamental principles of the clerical policy of the zemstvo liberal party of Chernihiv province as a basis for the ethno-confessional program of the opposition aristocratic fronde.

Conclusions. The analysis of historical sources allows us to state the fact that the clerical policy of the zemstvo liberal fronde of Chernihiv province was an organic and integral part of the ethno-confessional programmatic of the opposition movement in the region. Relations between the Russian Orthodox Church and the zemstvo liberal party of the region in the second half of the 19th century underwent a certain evolution: from aspirations of partnership and practical attempts of cooperation to social competition, and later opposition to each other. The demarcation line of the mentioned metamorphoses was the revolutionary change in the domestic political course of the Russian Empire – from the era of modernizations of Alexander II to the era of political reaction of Alexander III. In our opinion, the failure of broad interaction of the church with the system of elected institutions of local self-government and, in particular, the zemstvo opposition of Chernihiv province, was one of the reasons for the systemic crisis of Russian absolutism at the end of the 19th century.

Keywords: zemstvo liberal fronde, Chernihiv province, clerical policy, Russian Orthodox Church, clergy, parishioners

КЛЕРИКАЛЬНА ПОЛІТИКА ЗЕМСЬКОЇ ЛІБЕРАЛЬНОЇ ФРОНДИ ЧЕРНІГІВСЬКОЇ ГУБЕРНІЇ (1860-80-І РР.)

Назар Котельницький

Чернігівський інститут інформації, бізнесу і права Міжнародного науково-технічного університету імені академіка Ю. Бугая (Чернігів, Україна)

e-mail: subton7@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4480-365X>

АНОТАЦІЯ

Метою статті є з'ясування базових складових клерикальної політики земської ліберальної партії Чернігівської губернії, яка була невід'ємною та органічною частиною етноконфесійної програми цієї течії визвольного руху у Російській імперії другої половини XIX ст.

Наукова новизна роботи полягає у тому, що вперше в історичній науці зроблена спроба дослідження фундаментальних основ клерикальної політики земської ліберальної партії Чернігівської губернії як ґрунтовної бази етноконфесійної програми опозиційної аристократичної фронди.

Висновки. Аналіз історичних джерел дозволяє констатувати факт того, що клерикальна політика земської ліберальної фронди Чернігівської губернії була органічною та невід'ємною частиною етноконфесійної програматики опозиційної течії регіону. Взаємовідносини між Російською православною церквою та земською ліберальною партією краю у другій половині XIX ст. пройшли еволюцію: від прагнень партнерства та практичних спроб співробітництва до соціального змагання, конкуренції, опонування візаві. Демаркаційним маркером вказаних метаморфоз стала революційна зміна внутрішньополітичного курсу у Російській імперії – від епохи модернізацій Олександра II до доби політичної реакції Олександра III. На наше переконання, провал широкої взаємодії церкви з системою виборних інституцій місцевого самоврядування та, зокрема, земською опозицією Чернігівської губернії, став однією з причин системної кризи російського абсолютизму кінця XIX ст.

Ключові слова: земська ліберальна фронда, Чернігівська губернія, клерикальна політика, Російська православна церква, духовенство, парафіяни

INTRODUCTION

The history of the zemstvo liberal movement, including at the regional level, belongs to the least studied issues of Ukrainian historical science. The obvious relevance of the issue prompts scholars to continue studying the history of this trend of the liberation movement of the Russian Empire in the second half of the 19th century, at least at the regional level, including the territory of Chernihiv province (hubernia). Among the least known aspects of the zemstvo liberal party of the region functioning are the movement's ethno-confessional policy and its implementation in local self-government institutions.

The purpose of the research paper is to clarify the basic components of the party's clerical policy, which was an integral and organic part of the ethno-confessional program of the liberation movement.

HISTORIOGRAPHY AND SOURCE BASE

Modern historical science has only a few works of a general nature, in which the main milestones of the political activity of the zemstvo liberals of Ukrainian provinces

of the Russian Empire in the 1860-80s are discussed at the basic level¹. A large number of other aspects of the progressive activity of the aristocratic opposition fronde still remain a little-known phenomenon of Ukrainian history of the 19th century.

At the same time, Ukrainian historical science already has several publications that highlight the position of the zemstvo liberal fronde of Chernihiv province on the 'national problem' in the Romanovs empire, in particular, on the 'Jewish' and 'Ukrainian' issues². However, the attitude of the liberal zemstvo members of the region to the institutions of the Russian Orthodox Church and its representatives has never been the subject of a separate study. Therefore, filling the existing gap in historiography makes the current study highly relevant.

The basis for the study conducting is the published historical sources, namely the minutes and the minute-books of Chernihiv province povit and province zemstvo assemblies, which are stored in the specialized scientific and research libraries of the State Archives of Chernihiv Oblast and Chernihiv Oblast Historical Museum named after V. Tarnovskyi (Chernihiv, Ukraine). The absolute majority of historical sources are introduced into scientific circulation for the first time.

METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS AND RESEARCH TERMINOLOGY

While conducting the study, general scientific (methods of synthesis and analysis; deduction and induction; methods of classification, periodization, and generalization; descriptive) and special-historical (historical-typological, comparative-historical, problem-chronological) research methods are used, which in general ensured the fulfillment of the objectives set in the study.

General methods of scientific analysis and synthesis make it possible to understand the essence of historical processes in the Russian Empire of the second half of the 19th century, which directly influenced the formation of the clerical policy of Chernihiv province opposition aristocratic fronde, as well as to study certain aspects of the events and to make the necessary conclusions. With the help of inductive and deductive methods, the required complex of empirical materials is found and accumulated, which substantiates the imperatives of the study: factographic material forms theoretical definitions, while scientific conclusions are argued and illustrated by a certain empirical set of facts.

¹ Див., наприклад: *Жиленкова І.М.* Ліберально-демократичний рух в Україні (друга половина XIX – початок XX століття): автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук. Київ, 2000. 16 с.; *Мойсієнко В.М.* Ліберально-демократичний рух в Україні (середина 60-80 рр. XIX ст.): автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук. Київ, 1999. 19 с.; *Редькіна О.А.* Земства Лівобережної та Південної України як органи місцевого самоврядування та осередки ліберального руху в другій половині XIX – початку XX століття: автореф. дис... канд. іст. наук. Запоріжжя, 2002. 18 с.

² *Котельницький Н.А.* Єврейські погроми 1881 р. та земський лібералізм Північного Лівобережжя (60-80 рр. XIX ст.). *Євреї Лівобережної України. Історія та культура. Матеріали XIII Міжнародного наукового семінару.* Чернігів: Видавець Лозовий В.М., 2018. С. 44-55; *Котельницький Н.А.* «Єврейський вопрос» в деятельности земской либеральной фронды северной Украины 1880-х гг. *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: История России.* 2021. Т. 20. № 1. С. 32-46. DOI: 10.22363/2312-8674-2021-20-1-32-46; *Котельницький Н.А.* «Єврейська проблема» у роботі ліберальних земців північної України (80 рр. XIX ст.). *Євреї Лівобережної України. Історія та культура. Матеріали XV Міжнародного наукового семінару.* Чернігів: Видавець Лозовий В.М., 2021. С. 62-71; *Lebid A., Kotelnitsky N.* The Ukrainian Question in the Activity of the Zemstvo Liberal Opposition of Chernihiv Governorate (60-80th of XIX century). *Bylye Gody.* 2022. № 17 (3). С. 1153-1162. DOI: 10.13187/bg.2022.3.1153

Thanks to the usage of general methods of classification, periodization, and generalization, the author marks the periodization of the zemstvo liberal party of the region activities in the field of clerical politics, classifies the ideological priorities of the zemstvo liberal opposition of the region and their opponents, the representatives of conservative politicum, and summarizes the factual material. The descriptive method makes it possible to enunciate consistently the history of the formation of the clerical policy of Chernihiv province zemstvo liberal movement with a direct illustration of its manifestations at the level of both the public rhetoric of the aristocratic fronde representatives during the zemstvos meetings and the specific practical decisions of the povit and province zemstvos, adopted due to the insistence of the opposition.

Special historical research methods are also implemented. So, for example, the use of the comparative-historical method makes it possible to clarify the nature of the opposition aristocratic fronde of the region activity. The application of the problem-chronological method allows forming a general notion of the zemstvo liberal movement activities in the field of clerical policy in its chronological sequence and logical completeness. With the help of the historical-typological method, the typological characteristics of the ideological imperatives of both members of the opposition: the aristocratic fronde and their opponents, the representatives of the regional conservative politicum, concerning the problems of clerical politics, are defined.

As for the terms 'zemstvo liberal party' and 'fronde' used in the study, their use, in our opinion, is fully sound and theoretically substantiated. Both the outstanding researcher of the zemstvo history in the Russian Empire – B. Veselovskiy³, and the direct participants, witnesses, and eyewitnesses of political processes structuring in the zemstvo institutions of Chernihiv province – V. Khyzhniakov and S. Rusova⁴, fully confirmed the existence of two ideologically pronounced parties that carried on the sharpest political struggle: conservative, 'right', pro-government and 'left' – democratic, liberal, and oppositional.

In this context, the use of the term 'fronde' in relation to the zemstvo liberal party is quite logical, since modern historical and political sciences interpret this term as the general political and ideological opposition of a certain social movement to the current government. It should be emphasized that in the case of the zemstvo of Chernihiv province liberalism, it is not only a matter of public, declarative 'fronding' of the aristocratic opposition in the regional zemstvos assemblies, but also concerns the preparation, initiation, and practical implementation of modern reformation projects alternative to the government's policy.

DISCUSSION

The era of Great Reforms in the Russian Empire (1856-1874), the 'westernization' of the state, had a certain democratic influence on the society. However, that did not change the essence of the existence of the clergy as a specific, completely separated stratum of society, although a qualitatively new period of history clearly testified to the crisis of the so-called 'state ecclesiasticism', which consisted in the obvious reactionary

³ *Веселовский Б.Б.* История земства за сорок лет. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство О.Н. Поповой, 1909-1911. Т. 4. С. 302-457.

⁴ *Русова С.* Мої спомини. Київ: Віта-Україна, 1996. 208 с.; *Хижняков В.М.* Письма из Чернигова. О земских делах и деятелях. Письмо первое. Слово. 1878. № 10. С. 243-253.

archaism and social conservatism of the Empire's clerical world⁵. Church reforms of the 60s and 70s of the 19th century, which were authorized by Emperor Alexander II, relatively democratized the clerical body of the Russian Empire. Members of clergy families were granted civil rights and freedoms. Social isolation of the clerical world was undermined by giving young clerics career prospects outside the professional religious area. In order to neutralize the oppositional sentiments of the clergy representatives concerning the authorities, the exclusive legal preferences were reserved for the descendants of the clergy – they, like their parents, were exempted from paying basic state and municipal taxes, military service, and avoided corporal punishment, a shameful feudal archaism left to the peasantry⁶.

The Zemstvo Reform of 1864 provided clerical circles with the imperative of subjectivity in the public life of the state – the clergy got the right to run for the institutions of the zemstvo self-government. For the first convocations of the province and povit zemstvo assemblies, a noticeable number of councilors (*hlasnyi*), the representatives of churchdom, became a characteristic feature. As a rule, they were elected as deputies of the assembly from the electoral curia of landowners. However, as an outstanding researcher of the zemstvos in the Russian Empire, B. Veselovskiy, rightly pointed out, the priests never managed to take a worthy place in the functioning of the zemstvo self-government institutions. The reason for that, according to the mentioned scholar, was the non-perception of clergymen as an organic part of the deputy corps of the zemstvo assemblies, by the representatives of other social classes of society, mainly progressive landowners⁷.

In our opinion, the very liberal-democratic aura of the Great Reforms era played its role: The Russian Orthodox Church was rightly considered a feudal institution, and in the conditions of the second after Peter I global 'Europeanization' of the state, the problems of civil rights and freedoms, political representation as well as social and economic modernization came to the fore. Nevertheless, the Church got representation in elected public institutions of the zemstvo self-governance, sent its delegates, and thus reckoned on solving its problems with the help of tools and opportunities that province and povit zemstvo assemblies and councils obtained.

The church reforms carried out by the Russian monarchy, while having generally successfully solved a complex of urgent problems, also had several unresolved issues. Among the main ones was sufficient financial support for representatives of the regional and provincial clergy. The supreme power promised a pension, but it was only

⁵ Див., например: *Беглов А.* Кризис «государственной церковности» в фокусе приходского вопроса (1860-е – 1917). *Государство. Религия. Церковь*. 2019. № 1-2. С. 58-89. DOI: 10.22394/2073-7203-2019-37-1/2-58-89; *Попова А.* Александровская модернизация в глазах представителей духовного сословия. *Вестник Рязанского государственного университета имени А. Есенина*. 2017. № 4. С. 28-37, and others.

⁶ Див., например: *Карнишина Н.* Церковные реформы в России второй половины XIX в. *Известия высших учебных заведений. Поволжский регион. Гуманитарные науки. История*. 2015. № 3. С. 34-40; *Мендюков А.* Церковная реформа Александра II. *Актуальные проблемы гуманитарных знаний. Сборник научных статей*. Самара: СГТУ, 2009. С. 153-176; *Римский С.* Церковные реформы Александра II. *Вопросы истории*. 1996. № 4. С. 32-48; *Римский С.* Церковные реформы 60-70 гг. XIX в. *Отечественная история*. 1995. № 2. С. 163-171; *Смирнова Т., Каримов А.* Русская православная церковь в процессе модернизации Российской империи при Александре II. *Парадигмы истории и общественного развития*. 2018. Выпуск 11. С. 21-26, and others.

⁷ *Веселовский Б.Б.* История земства за сорок лет. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство О.Н. Поповой, 1909-1911. Т. 3. С. 50-51.

a prospect. The problem was that the clergy did not have the right to be engaged in commercial activities. For example, it was forbidden to carry out commercial transactions, rent out premises for amusement facilities, lend and borrow under bank promissory guarantees. In that context, priests could not be the subjects of legal agreements: they were not allowed to hire lawyers, be attorneys and representatives in other people's affairs, intercede for the needs of their own families, etc⁸. One way or another, the clerics had to look for options for permanent sources of income for life activities, since the charity of the congregation was not a stable financial factor.

The Russian Orthodox Church considered the functioning of an extensive network of parish trusteeships, which were established by imperial legislation on August 2, 1864, to be one of the options for solving its financial problems. Just those very institutions were allowed to seek funds for the maintenance of both parishes and their infrastructure, as well as the staff of clergy. However, unlike the zemstvo institutions of self-government, which got a permanent status, parish trusteeships were considered public charitable bodies, the activities of which directly depended on the activity of the leadership of eparchies, regional authorities, heads of provincial parishes, offerings of parishioners, and humanitarian philanthropy of wealthy persons who lived in certain communities⁹. Probable metamorphoses in the activities of parish trusteeships were compensated by the great trust in them of the supreme power, in contrast to the elected zemstvo assemblies and councils¹⁰.

Another option was close cooperation with the zemstvo self-government. According to the imperial legislation, the zemstvos got the right to introduce a permanent taxation system. In the clerics' opinion, that provided real opportunities for the material support of the clergy and infrastructure through the prospect of introducing zemstvo taxes for the needs of the Church. In addition, the clergy hoped to gain influence in the zemstvo schools, take well-paid teaching positions there, and increase their public authority by participating in the zemstvo affairs with the permission of the leadership¹¹.

The zemstvo institutions, on their part, also had their interest in that matter. As M. Iordanskyi, a pre-revolutionary researcher of Russian liberalism, rightly stated, the liberal zemstvo members were also interested in the institution of the church parish. Imperial legislation did not provide for the existence of a small unit of local self-government, accordingly, the zemstvo institutions did not have the appropriate influence on peasant volosts and communities. It was in that context that the zemstvo opposition was interested in parish trusteeships, because, in their opinion, each parish could well become a small unit of the zemstvo self-government, and also each such institution in the regions was a prospective community of the future zemstvo voters.

⁸ Фот А. Правовой статус приходского православного духовенства во второй половине XIX – начале XX в. *Вестник Оренбургского государственного педагогического университета*. 2015. № 2 (14). С. 92-103.

⁹ Кошелев А. О приходских попечительствах. Голос из земства. Выпуск первый. Москва: Типография В. Готье, 1869. С. 121-132.

¹⁰ Монахова О., Иванов Ю. Церковно-приходские попечительства и начальное народное образование в России в 1864-1914 гг. *Вестник Тверского государственного университета. Серия «История»*. 2011. Выпуск 4. С. 73-74.

¹¹ Римский С. Русская Православная Церковь в эпоху Великих реформ. Москва: Общество любителей церковной истории, 1999. С. 420-421.

Anyway, the parish was an instrument of maximum rapprochement of local self-government bodies with the population¹².

It was just in those two directions that the cooperation of the Russian Orthodox Church with the opposition aristocratic fronde of Chernihiv province began since the zemstvo bodies got the right to participate in the formation of budgets for parish trusteeships. We will analyze specific examples of such interaction on the territory of the region.

On September 21, 1868, at a meeting of Borzna povit zemstvo assembly, the problem of relations between Chernihiv Spiritual Consistory and Borzna povit zemstvo council was discussed. The main issue over which the dispute between institutions took place was the establishment of the parish trusteeships system. Chernihiv Spiritual Consistory sent a petition to Borzna zemstvo povit council, where it expressed its position in a categorical manner. Religious institution unequivocally responded that exclusively the eparchy bishops were responsible for the establishment of parish trusteeships, but not the zemstvo institutions. No one, except the Holy Synod and the eparchy bishop, had the right to influence the trusteeships already opened in Borzna povit, especially since there was not a single representative, a deputy from the clergy, in Borzna povit zemstvo assembly¹³.

The leader of the opposition aristocratic fronde, I. Petrunkevych, made a speech at the meeting, in which he outlined his vision of the situation. He stated that the povit zemstvo should not ignore such documents of the consistory, because the church department did not recognize the right of the zemstvo institutions to address various officials and bodies with petitions regarding the needs of the zemstvo and other elected public bodies functioning. The politician expressed his belief that the zemstvo institutes were formed of the same parishioners who formed the corresponding trusteeships. If they included only the representatives of the clergy, which had nothing to do with the zemstvo affairs in most respects, then the zemstvo institutions would not have considered themselves entitled to interfere in purely religious affairs. However, according to the leader of the liberal party, in that particular case, the situation looked somewhat different. Therefore, Borzna povit zemstvo appealed to Chernihiv Spiritual Consistory with a petition regarding the problems of establishing and maintaining parish trusteeships, as the clergy of Borzna povit opposed the proposed initiatives of the povit zemstvo. Thus, according to the official, it was about a conflict of two interests – the zemstvo and the church.

In the official response sent to Borzna povit zemstvo, Chernihiv Spiritual Consistory particularly drew the zemstvo's attention to the problems of its corporational representation and emphasized in principle that as soon as it established, the Ecclesiastical Department would not deny the right of the zemstvo institutions to apply for their interests. I. Petrunkevych focused the attention of the povit zemstvo assembly on the fact that the legislation on the zemstvo institutions did not provide for raising such an issue, since the zemstvo institutes were purely elected public representative bodies. If the clergy of Borzna povit did not have a representative in the zemstvo assemblies, then that was not a problem of the zemstvo institutions, but a manifestation of the voters' verdict, and they did not show a will to delegate their representation in

¹² *Иорданский Н.* Земство и приход. *Образование.* 1903. № 7-8. С. 55-56.

¹³ Журналы заседаний очередного Борзенского уездного земского собрания 1868 года. Чернигов: Ильинская типография, аренд. губ. зем. управой, 1868. № 2. С. 27-29.

the local self-government institutions to representatives of the Church. Therefore, according to the opinion of the opposition leader, the declared demands of the consistory showed the attempts to encroach on the legally established rights and freedoms of the zemstvo institutes by clerical circles.

Fully understanding the entire complex of complexities in relations between religious and public institutions, I. Petrunkevich proposed to send a Chernihiv Spiritual Consistory petition to Chernihiv povit zemstvo, as a regional zemstvo body, with a request to provide an expert assessment: what powers and competencies did the povit zemstvo institutions have under the current legislation in the case of submitting petitions to institutions of church power? What legal norms were at the disposal of the zemstvo bodies to protect and not give up their legal rights and interests, at the same not granting any privileges to the voters of spiritual rank? Borzna povit zemstvo assembly unanimously supported the proposal and sent a petition to Chernihiv province zemstvo¹⁴.

On September 28, 1868, Borzna povit zemstvo assembly considered the issue of regulating the povit tax system. In the course of the discussion, acrimonious debate arose on the problem of taxation of real estate assets of the regional clergy, primarily the representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church. The conservative nobility of the region initiated a proposal: completely exempt Orthodox priests from paying any taxes in the local self-government segment, as was done at the state level.

In his speech on behalf of the zemstvo liberal party, I. Petrunkevych stated that the exemption of a certain social class from paying taxes, in that case, the clergy, was a categorically unacceptable step. The leader of the opposition aristocratic fronde emphasized that the current imperial legislation allowed exemption from taxation by the zemstvo institutions only for a few separate social groups: persons who were below the poverty line and persons recognized as beggars, those, who did not have permanent places of residence. Since the clergy, according to the current legal framework, did not belong to the specified strata of society, there were no legal grounds to exempt priests from taxes. The official noted that the petition of the reactionary nobility would be perceived by the public as disrespecting the interests of other owners of property assets, real estate, and taxpayers because the provision of special status preferences for a separate social stratum of society would be a direct rudiment of the feudal system, a recurrence of the pre-reform era of the state's history. The zemstvo povit assembly supported the arguments of the leader of the opposition and held to preserve the taxation of the real estate assets of the regional priests¹⁵.

On September 20, 1869, at a meeting of Borzna povit zemstvo assembly, the response of Chernihiv Governor to the circular of the Ministry of Internal Affairs regarding the taxation by the zemstvo assembly of land allotments granted by the supreme power of the Russian Empire, in particular, the Government, for the maintenance of the Russian Orthodox Church infrastructure and the clergy body was considered. The loyal attitude of the province administration of the region to the government's demands for the participation of the zemstvo in the maintenance of church institutions in the form of certain payments caused a protest of Chernihiv province zemstvo liberal fronde.

¹⁴ Ibid. С. 30-31.

¹⁵ Журналы заседаний очередного Борзенского уездного земского собрания... № 9. С. 109.

A member of the opposition party N. Volk-Karachevskyi made a speech on that issue. He emphasized that in Borzna povit of Chernihiv province, except the village of Sydorivka, where there were lands donated by the state at the disposal of the parish, there were essentially no land assets that could be given to the Church by state institutions. There were only about 550 dessiatinas of land, donated to the povit clergy only by private individuals on a charitable basis, in order to ensure the activity of small units of the church infrastructure. Those land allotments were already taxed by povit and province tax system at the rate of 64 rubles and 87 kopecks for each dessiatina. However, the specified resources could not be excluded from the general area of the fiscal base, because it was about property donated by private individuals.

After a detailed discussion, Borzna povit zemstvo resolved: 1. to recognize as subject to the zemstvo taxation all lands donated to clerical circles by private patrons; 2. consider the village of Sydorivka as an exception, where there were state-granted land assets at the disposal of the Russian Orthodox Church; 3. to provide Chernihiv governor's administration with a set of arguments, calculations, and documentation regarding the specified issue¹⁶.

On September 26, 1870, at the meeting of Borzna povit zemstvo assembly, the question of the relationship between the zemstvo institutions and parish trusteeships in the region was again raised. N. Volk-Karachevskyi spoke on behalf of the opposition aristocratic fronde.

In his speech, a member of the liberal party of Chernihiv province focused the attention of the assembly's deputies on the fact that several areas of the zemstvo institutes and parish trusteeships activities coincided, and that fact should be rationally used for the sake of improving the life of the community. For example, both the zemstvo bodies and parish trusteeships had the task of finding resources for the establishment and maintenance of elementary schools, church parishes, and institutions for assisting the poor and mentally ill. According to the representative of the opposition, mutually beneficial contacts of the zemstvos with parish trusteeships could be very constructive, especially at the level of executive bodies – the povit and province zemstvo councils.

N. Volk-Karachevskyi noted that parish trusteeships could very well bring benefits to a broad public, having rejected the corporational interests of the Russian Orthodox Church. Thus, according to the representative of the aristocratic fronde, parish trusteeships, as charitable public institutions that were formed of representatives not only clerical circles, were quite capable of dealing with a complex of socially significant matters that, according to imperial legislation, were not within the competence of the zemstvo institutions. In particular, the specified bodies, in cooperation with the zemstvos, could have implemented the functions of supervision of fire-fighting infrastructure and relevant special equipment, organization of the system of night patrolling of villages and towns of the region, provision of a stable system of document circulation and clerical work in the institutions of town and the zemstvo self-government, etc.

N. Volk-Karachevskyi noted that the Church was a very important social institution, and therefore it had to participate in public affairs, especially if it wanted to have an influence on secular, representative institutions of self-government. And although

¹⁶ Журналы заседаний Борзенского уездного земского собрания 1869 года. Киев: Типография И. и А. Давиденко, 1869. № 1. С. 4-5.

mentioned measures were the competence of village constables, they were mostly not implemented, including due to the illiteracy of the mentioned provincial officials. The Russian Orthodox Church, on the other hand, had a great influence on almost all strata of society, being a consolidating spiritual force for the state and population. Borzna povit zemstvo unanimously supported the deputy and decided to apply with the appropriate initiative to Chernihiv Spiritual Consistory¹⁷.

As we can see, by the beginning of the 70s of the 19th century, the institutions of the Russian Orthodox Church and the opposition aristocratic fronde of Chernihiv province had several opportunities to agree on the terms and conditions of mutually beneficial cooperation. However, unfortunately, all those attempts failed. There were several reasons for that.

On the one hand, clerical circles counted on the fact that the zemstvo institutions would financially support the clergy by replacing the regular contributions of parishioners with a special zemstvo tax, which would be paid by all parishioners in the form of a land tax. In that way, the Church would avoid reproaches for systematic 'church extortions', which were widespread in the community, the main religious rites would become free for believers, and minor ones would have a fixed price list. Additionally, the priests hoped that the zemstvo self-government bodies would undertake a complex of issues related to the outreach of the lease of church infrastructure and commercial agreements for the use of food stocks. In a specific monetary equivalent, the clergy considered the following cost estimation for each parish: 300 rubles for psalm-readers, up to 900 rubles for father superiors. As a separate point, the clerics demanded that the zemstvo institutions financed existing church schools. The institutions of zemstvo self-government categorically refused the demands of the Russian Orthodox Church, since, firstly, the clergy did not make any proposals in response, which the zemstvos would have considered attractive, and secondly, the zemstvo institutions on principle denied even the theoretical possibility of Church institutions' domination in the field of public education¹⁸.

On the other hand, the clerical world categorically denied the demands of self-governing bodies to obtain control functions and supervision by the zemstvo institutions over church institutions, and the conceptual idea initiated by the zemstvo liberals about the election of priests by parishioners was fundamentally unacceptable for the clergy. The idea of electing the heads of parish trusteeships also caused great distrust on the part of the clergy: the opposition wanted to control the expenses from the budgets of those institutions and the financial affairs of the heads of religious centers in order to avoid corruption. Taxation introduced by the zemstvo institutions of Chernihiv province was perceived by the Church as an insult, a violation of the established legislative norms of the Russian Empire, and a disrespect of the clerical world's interests¹⁹.

By the way, we cannot but agree with the doctrinal opinion of M. Koliupanov, the famous intellectual of the Russian Empire of the second half of the 19th century, who, in a well-argued manner criticizing the parish trusteeships legislation, called to follow the

¹⁷ Журналы заседаний очередного Борзенского уездного земского собрания 1870 года. Чернигов: Земская типография, 1871. № 6. С. 51-52.

¹⁸ Римский С. Русская Православная Церковь в эпоху Великих реформ... С. 432-436.

¹⁹ Беглов А. Земские проекты переустройства православного прихода в 1860-1890 гг. *Государство. Религия. Церковь*. 2014. № 1. С. 172-200.

example of the institution of brotherhoods, which functioned very successfully in the Ukrainian lands that were the part of the great empire – the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In his opinion, it was the European principle of the community's self-governance and decentralization of power that was the way to the success of society's vital activities²⁰. It is far from accidental, in our opinion, that the parish trusteeships of just Ukrainian provinces of the Russian Empire were the most successful²¹.

However, the main thing was something else. We absolutely agree with the conclusions of A. Beglov, the prominent modern researcher of the history of the Russian Orthodox Church, who fairly emphasizes that there was no trust between the Church and the system of the zemstvo self-government. They perceived each other as competitors; the obvious element of social competition occurred. Globally, clergy and the progressive zemstvo members continued to belong to different ideological circles of the state: the first – to conservatives, the second – to democrats: metamorphoses of segregation thinking did not disappear anywhere²².

It should be noted that despite the actual failure of cooperation between the zemstvo institutions and the Russian Orthodox Church bodies, the zemstvo liberal party of Chernihiv province initiated the formation of partnership relations with the clerical circles of the region, which, in our opinion, eloquently testified to the persistent effort of the zemstvo opposition to influence the democratization of the region's religious institutions, to ensure the loyal attitude of the clergy to the political power, and, what was the most important, to have the opportunities for political agitation among the laity – direct voters of the zemstvo assemblies.

For example, on September 24, 1876, at a meeting of Horodnia povit zemstvo, the official report of O. Lindfors, a member of the regional povit school council, was considered. The reporting document was devoted to the problems of the development of elementary education in Horodnia povit of Chernihiv province. In the general context, the representative of the liberal opposition spoke about the role and importance of the religious segment in the procedures of public education, because there were numerous complaints that the representatives of the clergy treated their pedagogical activities in the zemstvo educational institutions in a purely formal and indifferent manner.

In particular, O. Lindfors noted that neither the state nor the senior clerical authority, nor the Ministry of Public Enlightenment, did all that was necessary for the clergy to become an organic part of the education system in the modernized Romanov empire. The speaker emphasized that the province clergy, due to the archaic nature of religious education, lack of the latest, progressive training and knowledge of pedagogical innovations, the heavy workload in official and corporational affairs, largely insufficient financial support of their own families, had no opportunity to pay due attention to their competence, attending classes and teaching of religious subjects in the zemstvo schools of Horodnia povit.

A member of the liberal fronde specifically noted that Scripture teaching could be useful in the secular zemstvo schools because the vast majority of students were of the Orthodox faith. Therefore, the specified subject in the zemstvo schools could be taught

²⁰ Колюпанов Н. Вопрос о церковно-приходских попечительствах. *Беседа*. 1872. № 12. С. 384-388.

²¹ Панков А. Церковно-общественные вопросы в эпоху Царя-освободителя. Санкт-Петербург: Типография А. Лопухина, 1902. С. 144-148.

²² Беглов А. Земские проекты переустройства православного прихода...

by the graduates of theological seminaries of Chernihiv province, especially since it was not prohibited by the imperial legislation. However, they should categorically not be engaged in secular education, but exclusively in religious subjects, including teaching church singing.

The deputy of the liberal party proposed the povit zemstvo assembly to approve the amount of the official salary of the mentioned zemstvo schools and professional school teachers in the amount of 250 rubles per year for each teacher. Since the number of graduates of spiritual educational institutions was not sufficient, O. Lindfors initiated an educational experiment, the essence of which was that each priest would be able to choose three villages near his place of residence and come there on clearly defined days for Scripture teaching. Of course, that should not interfere with the main service activities in the province parish. In addition, the representative of the liberals advocated that religious subjects could be taught by secular persons, but those who were already studying at spiritual educational institutions.

Finishing his report, O. Lindfors summarized his proposals:

1. to introduce the teaching of religious subjects by graduates of theological educational institutions at elementary schools and professional schools of Horodnia povit of Chernihiv province, officially inviting them to serve in the zemstvo institutions, with the appointment of a service fee of 250 rubles per year to each teacher. At the same time, it should be especially emphasized that they had no right to interfere in the teaching of secular subjects;

2. To send an official petition to Chernihiv province zemstvo assembly to grant permission for Scripture teaching by secular persons who were the students of spiritual educational institutions²³.

Having considered in detail the report of O. Lindfors, Horodnia povit zemstvo assembly unanimously held to approve and accept for bringing into effect all proposals²⁴. As we can see, the opposition aristocratic fronde of the region officially invited the young clergy of the region to become de facto hired zemstvo employees. Unfortunately, the clerical world did not reciprocate.

In the spring of 1881, a new era in the history of the state began in the Russian Empire. The new emperor, Alexander III, authorized the beginning of the period that contemporaries would have called the Counter-Reform era. In qualitatively new conditions, the relationship between the Russian Orthodox Church and the zemstvo liberal party of Chernihiv province radically changed. The supreme power switched to the open and unconditional patronage of the Russian Orthodox Church and the official state religion – Orthodoxy.

One of the main tools for the introduction of church counter-reforms in the regions and provinces of the Russian Empire was the establishment by the authorities of a large-scale network of renewed church-parochial schools. However, the opposition liberal fronde, not wanting to be the performer of the reactionary program of Emperor Alexander III, took a purely rational position regarding the specified educational institutions. It came down to a simple postulate: if the autocracy wanted to establish

²³ Доклад члена училищного совета от земства А.Ф. Линдфорса Городницкому земскому собранию. *Журналы очередного Городницкого земского собрания 1876 года*. Чернигов: Земская типография, 1877. С. 25-33.

²⁴ Журналы очередного Городницкого земского собрания 1876 года. Чернигов: Земская типография, 1877. № 2. С. 19.

such schools, it should do it using state funds and at the expense of the Russian Orthodox Church budget, and not from the cost estimations of the local self-government elected institutions. Only in the case of those conditions fulfillment, the zemstvo institutions agreed to help church-parochial schools financially, and moreover – to give the buildings of the zemstvo elementary schools at their disposal²⁵.

As V. Ivanovych rightly noted, in such a way, without directly opposing Russian absolutism, the progressive zemstvo members, firstly, in no way wanted to take political responsibility for the results of the activities of such schools, and secondly, took the major portion of those institutions funding beyond the limits of the zemstvo budgets and cost estimations of the peasant councils²⁶.

Already, in the context of the colossal spread of conservative restoration in the spiritual sphere, the initiatives of the supreme authority regarding the participation of the zemstvo institutions in the practical implementation of the 'new' religious policy took the form of demands and ultimatums. For example, on October 16-17, 1884, at the meeting of Nizhyn povit zemstvo assembly, the official petition of the Trustee of Kyiv Educational District to the Director of Public Schools of Chernihiv province was considered.

The instructional document in the ultimate form demanded, among other things, the teaching of church singing by all teachers of elementary educational institutions who had an ear for music; in case teachers refuse to do so, they should be dismissed from their positions; in public schools, where teachers could not teach church singing, entrust psalm-readers, specially invited with the approval of the eparchy councils, or other clergymen with such duties; when hiring teachers to educational institutions, be guided entirely by their ability to teach church singing and organizational abilities to organize church choirs; to teach unison church choral singing and organize choral groups, since that type of choral singing was the easiest at the initial stage, compared to polyphonic, say 4-part partes performance, which already required special, professional musical competences and significant musical development of pupils and students, etc²⁷.

The defiant tone of the official document caused the oppositional attitude of the representatives of the zemstvo liberal party of Chernihiv province. Thus, a member of the aristocratic fronde, O. Shlikevych, made a speech on that issue at the meeting. He especially emphasized that the system of public education in the state was mainly secular, with the exception of specialized religious educational institutions. Thus, the ultimate requirements of the Trustee of Kyiv Educational District regarding the mandatory teaching of church singing were absolutely unacceptable for elementary public schools and professional schools, because they went beyond the competence of secular education.

The representative of the liberals emphasized that the wishes of the central educational bureaucracy were not obligatory for the zemstvo institutions of the region, because the current imperial legislation, which concerned the system of local self-

²⁵ Веселовский Б.Б. История земства за сорок лет: В 4-х т. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство О.Н. Поповой, 1909-1911. Т. 1. С. 487-490.

²⁶ Иванович В. Земство и церковная школа. *Русское богатство*. 1903. № 7. С. 161.

²⁷ Отношение инспектора народных училищ 2-го района Черниговской губернии. *Журналы очередных заседаний Нежинского уездного земского собрания 1884 года и чрезвычайного собрания 10 августа 1884 года*. Киев: Типография Д. Повальского, 1885. С. 25-26.

government, in no way obligated and did not regulate the participation of the zemstvo institutions in the functioning of specialized corporational religious institutes, except various kinds of voluntary charitable institutions. Considering that, O. Shlikevych said that the povit zemstvo assembly should ignore the demands of the Trustee of Kyiv Educational District. In the future, the zemstvo bodies were obliged to continue the policy in public education determined by the legislation: secular persons who had the appropriate education should apply for the positions of teachers at schools and professional schools, regardless of their musical abilities, an ear for music, and ability to teach religious subjects, organize church choirs, and singing²⁸.

Nizhyn povit zemstvo assembly, having discussed the raised issue in detail, decided to send a petition to the Minister of Internal Affairs and the Government requiring a complete withdrawal, or a significant lessening of the ultimatum demands of the trustee of Kyiv educational district as such which threatening of the complete liquidation of a large-scale network of elementary education institutions in the province, which was one of the epoch-making achievements of the regional self-government system²⁹.

In the conditions of political reaction and ideological restoration, it was not at all surprising that the relations of the zemstvo liberal party of Chernihiv province with the clerical institutions of the region significantly deteriorated and the institutions became competitors and opponents. The opposition aristocratic fronde of the region no longer saw any sense in broad cooperation with the clergy, and the Russian Orthodox Church was disappointed in the church transformations initiated by Alexander II, and the attempts of institutional interaction with the elected self-government institutions. Such tendencies could be observed in the changing positions of the liberal zemstvo members of the region.

So, in particular, at the regular session of Chernihiv province zemstvo assembly on January 22, 1890, the deputy corps of the regional parliament considered the issue of remuneration of the work of clergymen by Oster povit of Chernihiv province zemstvo self-government bodies. A member of the opposition aristocratic fronde, V. Varzar, made a speech on that issue.

In his speech, he noted that Oster povit zemstvo assembly considered it inappropriate to allocate 100 rubles from the zemstvo budget as a service fee to the priest of the local parish, who had the duty to conduct the swearing-in ceremony of newly hired employees of the povit zemstvo council. The deputy emphasized that any expenditure on clerical services for the zemstvo institutes had no legal basis. Previously, local self-government bodies financed them exclusively in the form of charitable acts. Currently, similar transactions from the zemstvo budget were not supported by anything. Taking that into account, V. Varzar proposed to approve the decision of Oster povit zemstvo to refuse the allocation of 100 rubles as a fee to the priest of the local parish and to direct the funds to the financing of specialized institutions naming justices of the peace and peasant bodies, since the peasants were the main voter of the zemstvo institutions.

Chernihiv province zemstvo unanimously supported the proposal of V. Varzar and held: not to allocate 100 rubles from the budget of Oster povit zemstvo as a fee to the

²⁸ Журналы очередных заседаний Нежинского уездного земского собрания 1884 года и чрезвычайного собрания 10 августа 1884 года. Киев: Типография Д. Повальского, 1885. № 3. С. 14.

²⁹ Ibid. № 2. С. 12.

parish priest, since the clergy of the region previously got mentioned fees regularly; the specified funds should be directed to the maintenance of the staff of peasant local courts officials and the justices of the peace³⁰.

CONCLUSIONS

Summarizing the results of the study, we can assert that the analysis of little-known and little-studied historical sources, some of which are being introduced to international scientific circulation for the first time, allows us to state the fact that the clerical policy of the zemstvo liberal party of Chernihiv province was an organic and integral part of the ethno-confessional program of the studied oppositional trend in the liberation movement of the Russian Empire in the second half of the 19th century.

Church reforms implemented by Russian absolutism, despite their progressiveness, were unable to solve the issue of financial support for the clergy. Clerical circles hoped to solve that problem through the functioning of parish trusteeships, the budgets of which were formed from the funds of patrons and large-scale cooperation with the zemstvo institutions, which, in the clergy's opinion, had all the opportunities to support the institutes of the Russian Orthodox Church in the regions.

The categorical reluctance of the zemstvo institutions to allow the clerics to influence and control the processes of public education in the zemstvo schools on the one hand, and the fundamental refusal of the clergy for the zemstvo institutes to elect the priests and the heads of parish trusteeships, and for the local self-government bodies to control the expenses of the budgets of parish trusteeships and the activities of Church institutions on the other hand, did not give an opportunity to implement in practice the progressive idea of cooperation between the zemstvo institutions and clerical circles. The taxation of assets introduced by the zemstvo institutions of the region was perceived by the Church as an insult, a violation of the established legislative norms of the Russian Empire, and a disrespect for the interests of the clerical world.

Despite the failure of the idea of cooperation between the institutions of the Russian Orthodox Church and the zemstvo self-government institutions, the regional zemstvo liberal party officially offered the priests and clerics of the region to become the hired employees of the zemstvo institutions with clearly defined professional duties and official fees exclusively from the zemstvo budgets. With the assistance of the mentioned tools, the progressives hoped to democratize the clerical corporate body from within, to ensure the loyal attitude of the clergy to the liberal opposition, and to comprehensively strengthen their political influence among the parishioners – the peasants, who were the basic electorate of the zemstvo electoral processes.

Initiation of the Counter-Reform era radically changed the nature of the relationship between the clergy and members of the opposition aristocratic fronde. The clerical world and the zemstvo liberal party became competitors and later opponents. So, the representatives of the Church, disappointed in the church reforms of Alexander II, accepted the 'new' course of Emperor Alexander III with great enthusiasm. The representatives of the zemstvo opposition considered being categorically unacceptable the ultimate demands of the Russian Orthodox Church to the zemstvo institutes in the field of public education and financing of a large-scale network of renewed church-

³⁰ Журналы заседаний очередной сессии Черниговского губернского земского собрания 1889 года, состоявшейся с 15 по 25 января 1890 года. № 9. С. 210-213; Земский сборник Черниговской губернии. Чернигов: Земская типография, 1890. № 8.

parochial schools as a spreader of reaction and political restoration in the state. As a result, on the initiative of the regional zemstvo liberal members, the zemstvo bodies refused to finance the activities of the region's clergy.

However, despite the great deterioration of relations between these institutions, the zemstvo liberal party and the clergy of the region did not become irreconcilable antagonists. The absolute majority of oppositionists were Orthodox and always demonstrated strong loyalty to the institutions of the Church.

In general, historical sources convincingly show that the relationship between the Russian Orthodox Church and the liberal opposition fronde of Chernihiv province in the second half of the 19th century had undergone an evolution: from aspirations of partnership and practical attempts at cooperation to social competition, and later opposition to each other. The demarcation line of those metamorphoses was the revolutionary change in the domestic political course in the Russian Empire from the era of modernizations of Alexander II to the era of political reaction of Alexander III. In our opinion, the failure of the extensive interaction of the Church with the system of elected institutions of local self-government became one of the reasons for the systemic crisis of Russian absolutism at the end of the 19th century.

REFERENCES

- Beglov, A.** (2019). Krizis «gosudarstvennoi tserkovnosti» v fokuse prikhodskogo voprosa (1860-e – 1917) [The Crisis of «State Churchness» in the Focus of the Parish Question (1860s – 1917)]. *Gosudarstvo. Religiiia. Tserkov, 1-2*, 58-89. DOI: 10.22394/2073-7203-2019-37-1/2-58-89 [in Russian].
- Beglov, A.** (2014). Zemskie proekty pereustroistva pravoslavnogo prikhoda v 1860-1890 gg. [Zemstvo's projects for the reconstruction of the Orthodox parish in 1860-1890]. *Gosudarstvo. Religiiia. Tserkov, 1*, 172-200 [in Russian].
- Fot, A.** (2015). Pravovoi status prikhodskogo pravoslavnogo dukhovenstva vo vtoroi polovine XIX – nachale XX v. [Legal status of the parish Orthodox clergy in the second half of the 19th – early 20th centuries]. *Vestnik Orenburgskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta, 2 (14)*, 92-103 [in Russian].
- Iordanskii, N.** (1903). Zemstvo i prikhod [Zemstvo and Parish]. *Obrazovanie, 7-8*, 55-56 [in Russian].
- Ivanovich, V.** (1903). Zemstvo i tserkovnaia shkola [Zemstvo and Church school]. *Russkoe bogatstvo, 7*, 161 [in Russian].
- Karnishina, N.** (2015). Tserkovnye reformy v Rossii vtoroi poloviny XIX v. [Church reforms in Russia in the second half of the 19th century]. *Izvestiia vysshikh uchebnykh zavedenii. Povolzhskii region. Gumanitarnye nauki. Istoriiia, 3*, 34-40 [in Russian].
- Khizhniakov, V.** (1878). Pisma iz Chernigova. O zemskikh delakh i deiateliakh. Pismo pervoe [Letters from Chernigov. About zemstvo affairs and figures. The first letter]. *Slovo, 10*, 243-253 [in Russian].
- Koliupanov, N.** (1872). Vopros o tserkovno-prikhodskikh popechitelstvakh [The question of Church and parish guardianship]. *Beseda, 12*, 345-390 [in Russian].
- Koshelev, A.** (1869). *O prikhodskikh popechitelstvakh. Golos iz zemstva* [On parish guardianships. Voice from the Zemstvo]. Issue I. Moskva: Tipografiia V. Gotie, pp. 121-132 [in Russian].
- Kotelnytskyi, N.** (2018). Evreiski pogromy 1881 r. ta zemskiy liberalizm Pivnichnoho Livoberezhzhia (60-80 rr. XIX st.) [Jewish pogroms of 1881 and Zemstvo' liberalism of the Ukrainian Northern Left Bank (1860-80s)]. In *Evrei Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy. Istoriiia ta kultura. Materialy XIII Mizhnarodnogo naukovooho seminaru*. Chernihiv, pp. 44-55 [in Ukrainian].
- Kotelnytskyi, N.** (2021). «Evreiska problema» u roboti liberalnykh zemstiv pivnichnoi Ukrainy (80 rr. XIX st.) [«Jewish problem» in the work of liberal Zemstvos of Northern Ukraine (1880s)]. In *Evrei Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy. Istoriiia ta kultura. Materialy XV Mizhnarodnogo naukovooho seminaru*. Chernihiv, pp. 62-71 [in Ukrainian].
- Kotelnitskiy, N.** (2021). «Evreiskii vopros» v deiatelnosti zemskoi liberalnoi frondy severnoi Ukrainy 1880 gg. [«Jewish question» in the activities of the regional liberal front of Northern Ukraine in

- 1880]. *Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta družby narodov. Serii «Istoriia Rossii», 20 (1), 32-46*. DOI: 10.22363/2312-8674-2021-20-1-32-46 [in Russian].
- Lebid, A. & Kotelnitsky, N.** (2022). «Ukrainskiy vopros» v deyatelnosti zemskoy liberalnoy oppozitsii Chernigovskoy gubernii (60-80 gg. XIX v.) [The Ukrainian Question in the Activity of the Zemstvo Liberal Opposition of Chernihiv Governorate (60-80th of XIX century)]. *Bylye Gody, 17(3), 1153-1162*. DOI: 10.13187/bg.2022.3.1153 [in Russian].
- Lindfors, A.F.** (1877). Doklad chlena uchilishchnogo soveta ot zemstva A.F. Lindforsa Gorodnitskomu zemskomu sobraniuu [Report of the member of the school council from the Zemstvo A.F. Lindfors to the Gorodnitsky Zemstvo Assembly]. *Zhurnaly ocherednogo Gorodnitskogo zemskogo sobraniia 1876 goda*. Chernigov: Zemskaia tipografiia. Pp. 25-33 [in Russian].
- Mendiukov, A.** (2009). Tserkovnaia reforma Aleksandra II [Church reform of Alexander II]. *Aktualnye problemy gumanitarnykh znaniy. Sbornik nauchnykh statei*. Samara, pp. 153-176 [in Russian].
- Moisiienko, V.** (1999). *Liberalno-demokratychnyi rukh v Ukraini (seredyna 60-80 rr. XIX st.)* [Liberal-democratic movement in Ukraine (mid. 60-80's of the XIX century)]. (Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
- Moniakova, O. & Ivanov, Yu.** (2011). Tserkovno-prikhodskie popechitelstva i nachalnoe narodnoe obrazovanie v Rossii v 1864-1914 gg. [Church and parish patronage and primary public education in Russia in 1864-1914]. *Vestnik Tverskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Serii «Istoriia», 4, 70-82* [in Russian].
- Papkov, A.** (1902). *Tserkovno-obshchestvennye voprosy v epokhu Tsaria-osvoboditelia* [Church and public issues in the Era of the Tsar-liberator]. Sankt-Peterburg [in Russian].
- Redkina, O.** (2002). *Zemstva Livoberezhnoi ta Pivdennoi Ukrainy yak orhany mistsevoho samovriaduvannia ta oseredky liberalnogo rukhu v druhii polovyni XIX – pochatku XX stolittia* [Zemstvos of the Left Bank and Southern Ukraine as bodies of local self-government and centers of the liberal movement in the second half of the XIX – early XX centuries]. (Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis). Zaporizhzhia [in Ukrainian].
- Rimskiy, S.** (1995). Tserkovnye reformy 60-70 gg. XIX v. [Church reforms in 1860-70s]. *Otechestvennaia istoriia, 2, 163-171* [in Russian].
- Rimskiy, S.** (1996). Tserkovnye reformy Aleksandra II [Church reforms of Alexander II]. *Voprosy istorii, 4, 32-48* [in Russian].
- Rimskiy, S.** (1999). *Ruskaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov v epokhu Velikikh reform* [Russian Orthodox Church in the Era of the Great Reforms]. Moskva [in Russian].
- Popova, A.** (2017). Aleksandrovskaiia modernizatsiia v glazakh predstavitelei dukhovnogo soslovia [The Alexander' modernization in the eyes of representatives of the clergy]. *Vestnik Riazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni A. Esenina, 4, 28-37* [in Russian].
- Rusova, S.** (1996). *Moi spomyny* [My memories]. Kyiv: Vita-Ukraina [in Ukrainian].
- Smirnova, T. & Karimov, A.** (2018). Ruskaia pravoslavnaia tserkov v protsesse modernizatsii Rossiiskoi imperii pri Aleksandre II [Russian Orthodox Church in the process of modernization of the Russian Empire under Alexander II]. *Paradigmy istorii i obshchestvennogo razvitiia, 11, 21-26* [in Russian].
- Veselovskiy, B.** (1909). *Istoriia zemstva za sorok let* [The history of the Zemstvo for forty years]. Vol. 1. Sankt-Peterburg [in Russian].
- Veselovskiy, B.** (1911). *Istoriia zemstva za sorok let* [The history of the Zemstvo for forty years]. Vol. 3 & 4. Sankt-Peterburg [in Russian].
- Zhilenkova, I.** (2000). *Liberalno-demokratychnyi rukh v Ukraini (druga polovyna XIX – pochatok XX stolittia)* [The liberal-democratic movement in Ukraine (the second half of the 19th – early 20th century)]. (Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis). Kyiv [in Ukrainian].