


<https://doi.org/10.18778/1644-857X.22.02.04>

OLEKSANDR CHUCHALIN  
UNIwersytet Pedagogiczny im. Pawła Tytyny w Humanii /  
PAVLO TYCHYNA UMAN STATE PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY  
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3876-8237>

## The Reports of the Ober-Procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod as a Source for the Study of the Situation in the Kyiv Eparchy and Its Monasteries in the Second Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and Early 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries

STRESZCZENIE

**Sprawozdania naczelných prokuratorów Świętego Synodu Zarządzającego jako źródło badania sytuacji diecezji kijowskiej i jej klasztorów w drugiej połowie XIX i na początku XX wieku**

Celem artykułu jest aktualizacja problematyki kwerendy publikowanych źródeł dotyczących dziejów Cerkwi prawosławnej na Ukrainie, a także uzupełnienie dotychczasowego dorobku w tym zakresie oraz bardziej szczegółowa analiza informacji o sytuacji i działalności Cerkwi prawosławnej na Ukrainie. Diecezję kijowską i jej klasztory opisano w publikowanych sprawozdaniach prokuratorów naczelných Świętego Synodu Rządzącego z lat 1884–1914.

W prezentowanym artykule po raz pierwszy opublikowano i udostępniono historykom „Kompleksowe Sprawozdania Prokuratorów Naczelných Świętego Synodu” za lata 1884–1914, dostarczając im informacji o pozycji diecezji kijowskiej, jej duchowieństwie – jego liczbie czy składzie, działalności kulturalnej, oświatowej i charytatywnej jej klasztorów.

Stwierdzono, że zasób informacji sprawozdań naczelných prokuratorów Świętego Synodu Panującego o sytuacji diecezji kijowskiej i jej klasztorów praktycznie nie jest wykorzystywany w literaturze naukowej. Zauważono, że meldunki naczelných prokuratorów Świętego Synodu Panującego, skierowane do zwierzchnika rosyjskiej



Cerkwi prawosławnej – cesarza rosyjskiego, stanowią ważne i niezwykle pouczające źródło dla współczesnych badaczy, którego znajomość pozwoli ocenić ogólny stan głównego wyznania cesarstwa, poprzez dane dotyczące konkretnie diecezji kijowskiej w każdym kolejnym roku kalendarzowym. Raporty miały stosunkowo stabilną strukturę i były publikowane w formie osobnej książki. Ich analiza pozwala na ustalenie roli i miejsca hierarchów diecezji kijowskiej w ogólnej strukturze rosyjskiej Cerkwi prawosławnej, ich składu personalnego oraz działalności.

Na szczególną uwagę zasługują zawarte w sprawozdaniach informacje o liczbie klasztorów prawosławnych diecezji kijowskiej oraz liczbie mnichów, które pozwalają prześledzić dynamikę zmian zachodzących na przestrzeni trzydziestu lat. Opracowanie sprawozdań ujawnia nowe strony funkcjonowania klasztorów prawosławnych obwodu kijowskiego, koncentrujących się na działalności charytatywnej i kulturalno-oświatowej.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Święty Synod Panujący, prokurator naczelny, raport, diecezja kijowska, metropolita, klasztor, monastycyzm

#### ABSTRACT

The purpose of the article is to cast light upon the problem of researching published sources on the history of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, as well as to supplement the achievements of previous researchers and to propose a detailed analysis of the situation and activities of the Kyiv diocese and its monasteries, presented in the published reports of the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod between 1884 and 1914.

The scientific novelty of the material presented in this article lies in the fact that, for the first time in the national historiography, “All-Public Reports of the Ober-Procurators of the Holy Synod” between 1884–1914, which were published and open to the general scientific community, were subjected to a detailed analysis. The authors also clarify the level and significance of information about the situation in the Kyiv Eparchy, its clergy, its numbers, its composition, as well as the cultural, educational and charitable activities of its monasteries.

The article argues that the essence of the reports by the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod on the situation in the Kyiv Eparchy and its monasteries is practically undeveloped in the scientific literature. Such reports were addressed to the head of the Russian Orthodox Church – the Russian Emperor. They are an important and extremely informative source for modern researchers, familiarity with which will permit them to assess the general condition of the main confession in the empire. More specifically, these reports reveal the state of the Kyiv Eparchy for each calendar year. Every report had a relatively standard structure and was published as a separate book. An analysis of these sources makes it possible to establish the role and place of the hierarchs of the Kyiv Eparchy in the overall structure of the Russian Orthodox Church, as well as their personnel and activities.

Furthermore, additional information, provided in the reports on the number of Orthodox monasteries in the Kyiv Eparchy and the number of monks, is of particular interest, which allows the authors to trace the dynamics in changes

in these numbers over thirty years. The study of the reports reveals new information on the life in the Orthodox monasteries in the Kyiv region, in relation to their charitable, cultural and educational activities.

**Keywords:** Holy Ruling Synod, ober-procurator, report, Kyiv Eparchy, metropolitan, monastery, monasticism

**I**N recent decades, cultural and intellectual life in Ukraine has been characterized by increasing interest in its historical past, including the level of religious intensity as well. The formation and development of the society's democratic foundations are impossible without the dissemination of deep scientific knowledge about various spheres of human activity, which were on the periphery of professional historians' attention until recently. First of all, this directly concerns a significant and complex problem of relations between the state and the Orthodox Church.

Gradual entry of the Orthodox Church and its structures into the society of the post-Soviet space has led to an ever-growing research interest in the history of individual dioceses, monasteries and monasticism, its legal and material condition, and social status in the synodal period. The study of this period of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, which chronologically marks the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> to the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, requires that researchers involve the entire range of sources, among which the reports of the ober-procurators<sup>1</sup> of the Holy Ruling Synod occupy an important place. Currently, due to complex Russian-Ukrainian relations and open military aggression against independent Ukraine, Ukrainian historians have practically no access to the Russian federal archives, which contain the bulk of documents on the activities of the central authorities and their departments, including the activities of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine in the synodal period. Therefore, modern historians pay special attention to published sources, including their analysis and identification of their informational content. We can attribute "All reports of the ober-procurators of the Holy Synod" between 1884–1914

---

<sup>1</sup> Ober procurator is one of the highest-ranking officials in the Russian Empire, who serves as the representative of the Emperor and the head of the Russian Orthodox Church in the Most Holy Synod, the actual leader of the Russian Orthodox Church since the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

to such sources. They characterize the attitude of the state to the situation in Orthodox dioceses, their monasteries and monasticism in Ukraine. We refer to the reports published, digitized and posted on the libraries' websites.

New sources and materials will make it possible to form a more objective view of the history of the Kyiv Eparchy and its monasteries in the synodal period.

The informational content problem of the reports by the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod on the situation in the Kyiv Eparchy and its monasteries has not been reasonably developed in the scientific literature. Some scientific research, the article by G. Bezhanidze and A. Firsov in particular, studied the state of the Orthodox Church throughout the Russian Empire as well as the activities of the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod in the synodal system of the church governance<sup>2</sup>. Still, while exploring the problem of church-state relations through the prism of the activities of the ober-procurators in particular, the authors do not mention their form of reporting to the emperor although they were his or her proteges in the supreme governing body of the Russian Orthodox Church. In a separate article, A. Firsov analyzed the reports by the heads of the Orthodox Confession Department belonging to the Russian Orthodox Church<sup>3</sup> during the reign of Emperor Nicholas I (1825–1855). These reports were found and studied by A. Firsov among the stacks of the Russian State Historical Archive. The author carried out the research according to the chronological principle, which does not allow us to clearly understand and assess the dynamics of the processes that the Orthodox Church experienced in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

In these stacks, the materials relating to the dioceses located in the Ukrainian lands of those times, and the Kyiv diocese primarily, would be of particular interest to a Ukrainian researcher.

Among Ukrainian scholars, the works by A. Kukuruza, A. Petrenko<sup>4</sup>, I. Opri, Z. Svyatchenko, as well as the dissertations by

---

<sup>2</sup> H.V. Bezhanidze, A.H. Firsov, *Ober-prokurory Sviateisheho synoda o synodalnoi systeme tserkovnoho upravleniya*, "Vestnyk Ystorycheskoho obshchestva Sankt-Peterburhskoi Dukhovnoi Akademyy" 2021, no. 1(6), pp. 41–50.

<sup>3</sup> S.L. Firsov, *Otchety ober-prokuratorov Sviateisheho Pravytelstvuiushcheho Synoda epokhy ymperatora Nykolaia Pavlovycha kak ystochnyk po ystoriyy Pravo-slavnoi Rossyiskoi Tserkvy*, "Khrystyanskoe chtenye" 2001, no. 5, pp. 179–199.

<sup>4</sup> A.A. Petrenko, *Mytropolyt Kyivskyy i Halytskyi Platon (Horodetskyi): administratyvna, relihiino-prosvitnytska ta misionerska diialnist*, dys. kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.01 – istoriia Ukrainy, Kyiv 2016.

A. Petrenko and N. Lavrinenko<sup>5</sup> reveal the interest in the published reports of the ober-procurators of the Holy Synod as a source for studying certain aspects of the history of Ukraine. In particular, based on the reports of the ober-procurators of the Holy Synod, the article by A. Kukuruza<sup>6</sup> researches the situation of theological academies of the late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, including Kyiv. The author presents the statistical data analysis of the reports, which allowed the author to establish the changes of the number of students at theological academies in general, and in the context of each institution in particular, as well as to find out the reasons for the growth in the number of foreign students. In I. Opri<sup>7</sup> article, the reports by the ober-procurators of the Holy Synod were used to study: the religious situation in Right-Bank Ukraine in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, ethno-confessional problems of the region, the strengthening of Catholicism, and social issues. The study by Z. Sviashchenko<sup>8</sup> characterizes the informative potential of these reports and shows the possibilities of applying them in the study of the history of Kyiv and the Kyiv diocese of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

The purpose of this article is to expand the source base for the study of the history of the Kyiv Eparchy and its monasteries in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, to update the problem of researching published sources on the history of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine, as well as to supplement the achievements of previous researchers, and to analyze in more detail the information about the situation and activities of the Kyiv Eparchy and its monasteries presented in the reports of the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod between 1884 and 1914.

In the history of Ukraine, Orthodoxy played a prominent role and had a decisive influence on all aspects of societal development. It is

<sup>5</sup> N.P. Lavrinenko, *Sotsialno-ekonomichne stanovyshche ta kulturno-osvitnia diialnist pravoslavnykh monastyriiv pivdnia Kyivskoi yeparkhii (1793–1917 rr.)*, avtoref. dys. kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.01 – istoriia Ukrainy, Cherkasy 2008.

<sup>6</sup> A.V. Kukuruza, *Dukhovni akademii v kintsi XIX – na pochatku XX st. (za zvitamy Ober-prokurora Sviatiishoho Synodu)*, “Intelihentsiia i vlada, Seriia: Istoriiia” 2015, no. 33, pp. 22–36.

<sup>7</sup> I.A. Opriia, *Pytannia relihiinoi istorii Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy druhoi polovyny XIX – pochatku XX st. u zvitakh ober-prokurora Sv. Synodu*, “Visnyk Kamianets-Podilskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. Ivana Ohiiienka, Istorychni nauky” 2015, no. 8, pp. 77–84.

<sup>8</sup> Z. Sviashchenko, *Kyivska yeparkhiia u zvitakh ober-prokuroriv Sviatiishoho synodu (1884–1916 rr.)*, “Eminak” 2020, no. 3(31), pp. 80–87.

impossible to recreate the history of this country without the history of the Orthodox Church. In this regard, the problem of studying various aspects of its history, and the situation of Orthodox dioceses and monasteries, is becoming more topical. The Kyiv Eparchy occupied, in the past and present, a special place in Ukrainian church history. However, the state of the Kyivan Eparchy and its monasteries in the synodal period belongs to the little-studied pages of the history of Ukraine. Therefore, a careful study of the published sources, including the reports of the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, will enable modern historians to objectively, systematically and comprehensively consider the historical and cultural processes of the development of Ukraine during that period.

The scientific problem mentioned above requires a brief overview of the founding of the Holy Ruling Synod, the positions of the ober-procurators, and the organization of its activities and powers. During the reforms designed to establish the Russian Empire in the first decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the full integration of the Orthodox Church into the state structure became of great importance. In 1718, the Ecclesiastical Collegium was established as a body of collegial church governance, which was renamed the Holy Ruling Synod in February 1721. A year later, the post of the ober-procurator of the Holy Synod was created – a civilian official who reported directly to the Russian monarch and exercised control over church activities. The Holy Synod, as the highest authority of the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC), became more and more dependent on the state over time, and the power of the ober-procurator gradually increased, respectively.

There are two phases in the development of the ober-procurator's office. The first phase began with the establishment of this position in 1722 and lasted until 1803. During this period, the power of the ober-procurator was crucial in the activities of the Holy Synod, as he was in direct contact with the head of the state. The second phase began in 1817 and lasted for the next hundred years, that is, until the end of the synodal period in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church. During this period, there was a *de facto* termination of direct contact between the emperor and the Holy Synod, as the ober-procurator emerged as an authorized and omnipotent minister, the sole representative of the Holy Synod to the government. He was delegated the powers of

a representative of the institution called the “Department of Orthodox Confession of the Russian Empire”.

The reports of the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod between 1884 and 1914, were formed during the tenure of K. Pobedonostsev (1880–1905), then continued under his successors: O. Obolensky (1906), O. Shirinsky–Shikhmatov (1906), P. Izvol'sky (1906–1909), S. Lukyanov (1909–1911) and V. Sabler (1911–1915)<sup>9</sup>. These reports were addressed to the head of the Russian Orthodox Church – the Russian Emperor, and represent an important and extremely informative source, familiarity with which allows us to assess the general state of the main denomination of the empire and specifically the Kyiv diocese for each calendar year. The reports by the ober-procurators were formed based on diocesan' submissions, which they sent to the Holy Ruling Synod under the decree of November 23, 1865<sup>10</sup>. For our study, information about the situation in the Kyiv diocese and its monasteries is invaluable, and the statistics presented in the reports make it possible to accurately assess it.

The structure of all reports by the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod between 1884–1914 was based on almost the same principle. The number of sections was not constant as it varied depending on the presence of significant, or anniversary, events in the reporting year. However, the information blocks reveal the following information:

- the system of governance in the Russian Orthodox Church,
- the conditions of its churches and monasteries; missionary activity,
- the fight against schism and sectarianism,
- reviews of the situation of the Orthodox Church abroad,
- issues of spiritual education and the state of spiritual and educational institutions,
- material resources of church institutions and church administration remained constant.

<sup>9</sup> D.N. Shylov, *Hosudarstvennye deiateli Rossyiskoi ymperyy: Glavy vysshykh y tsentralnykh uchrezhdeniy. 1802–1917: Byobyblyohr. sprav*, Sankt-Peterburh 2001, pp. 612–620.

<sup>10</sup> *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossijskoj imperii, sobranie 2-oe*, St. Petersburg 1830–1881, vol. XL, ch. 2, no. 42701.



Each of the reports necessarily contained some annexes with information by dioceses<sup>11</sup> on: the status and number of men's and women's monasteries; the number of monks and novices; quantitative indicators of persons of the Orthodox faith; the number of born, married, divorced and deceased; the number of religious schools, their teaching staff and students; about the parables that were financed according to the cost estimated by the spiritual department; sums addressed to care for the poor of the clergy; information about hospitals and almshouses organized at churches and monasteries; the number of people who converted to Orthodoxy annually; libraries at churches, *etc.*

An important component of the reports by the ober-procurators was the issue of synodal and diocesan administration. The Holy Ruling Synod was the supreme governing body of the Russian Orthodox Church, which controlled and directed its activities in line with the laws of the state, and monitored compliance with the norms of coexistence of the state and the Church. According to the Spiritual Regulations of 1721, which was actually a church charter, the Holy Ruling Synod was recognized as the central governing body of the ROC. This document regulated the functions, composition, routine, forms and methods of the Holy Ruling Synod's activities. The board of the Synod consisted of 12 representatives of white and black clergy. These were three bishops, among whom the Metropolitan<sup>12</sup> of Kyiv and Galicia being obligatorily presented, as well as archimandrites<sup>13</sup>, abbots, archipriests "as many worthy ones are found".

The jurisdiction of the Holy Ruling Synod included the issues of Orthodox faith and morality, the fight against the schism of the church, heretical teachings and sectarianism. It had the right to establish new holidays and rites, canonize saints, publish the Holy Scriptures and liturgical books, as well as impose censorship on works of theological, church-historical and canonical content. The Synod exercised supreme supervision over the implementation of church laws by all members of the Church and the

---

<sup>11</sup> Eparchy is an ecclesiastical unit in Eastern Christianity headed by a ruling bishop.

<sup>12</sup> Metropolitan is a bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church, the head of a metropolitanate, i.e., a large ecclesiastical unit consisting of several dioceses.

<sup>13</sup> Archimandrite is a title given to the abbot of a monastery (or several monasteries), which was introduced in the Russian Orthodox Church in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.



spiritual education of the people, and had the right to petition the highest state authorities for the needs of the Church<sup>14</sup>. Among the entire scope of the Holy Synod's activities, personnel issues were the top priority, namely, the appointment and removal of abbots of the monasteries; members and secretaries of a spiritual consistory; archimandrites, abbots, archpriests; the awarding of church prizes. The establishment of new monasteries was also exclusively the prerogative of the Synod. Therefore, information about these events was reflected in the reports by the ober-procurators.

On analyzing the published reports, it was found that the permanent composition of the Holy Ruling Synod of the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries was formed by the three metropolitans of: Novgorod and St. Petersburg, Kyiv, and Moscow and Kolomna, as well as archbishops<sup>15</sup> of: Holmsk–Warsaw, Chisinau and Khotyn, Vladimir and Suzdal, Kharkiv and Okhtyrka, the Exarch of Georgia and the bishops<sup>16</sup> of Caucasus and Ekaterinodar, Polotsk and Vitebsk. It should be emphasized that the Metropolitan Platon of Kyiv and Halych was a member of the Holy Ruling Synod for almost 10 years. The bishop was noted for his active position and administrative activity, using his membership in the Holy Synod to develop internal and external processes of the Kyiv Eparchy<sup>17</sup>, promoted the idea of administrative decentralization and reformed the structure of the Holy Synod<sup>18</sup> itself. After his death on October 1, 1891, Bishop Ioanikii<sup>19</sup> was transferred to the post of Metropolitan of Kyiv on November 17, 1891, from the post of Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna.

The information provided in the annual reports on the number of dioceses of the Russian Orthodox Church and its hierarchies makes it possible to form general statistics and trace the dynamics

<sup>14</sup> O. Prykhod'on, *Povnovazhennia y orhaanizatsiini zminy v strukturi Sviatishoho synodu v druhii chverti XIX st.*, "Naukovi zapysky Ternopijskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka, Ser. Istoriia" 2014, no. 1, ch. 2, pp. 110–115.

<sup>15</sup> Archbishop is a ruling bishop and the head of a large ecclesiastical unit consisting of several eparchies.

<sup>16</sup> Bishop is a church figure of the highest rank in Orthodox, Anglican and Catholic churches, the head of a church district.

<sup>17</sup> *Institut rukopisu NBUV*, f. 174, op. 2, spr. 3365–3407, ark. 183.

<sup>18</sup> A.A. Petrenko, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

<sup>19</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejshego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1890 i 1891 gody*, Sankt-Peterburg 1893, p. 3.

of their growth. Thus, the ober-procurator's report for the year 1884 contains information about the existence of 60 dioceses<sup>20</sup> on the territory of the Russian Empire, while the report for 1914 enumerated 67<sup>21</sup>. The analysis of all published reports from 1884 to 1914 explains these dynamics through the expansionary policy of the Russian tsar and the missionary activities of the Russian Orthodox Church on the annexed territories. The Russian imperial policy of influence on the regions through the ROC was reflected in the situation of the Kyiv Eparchy, its hierarchs, churches, monasteries and monasticism.

Bishops, presbyters, deacons and other church clergies; monastics; religious schools, their teachers and students, *etc.* were under the control of the Holy Ruling Synod. Concerning these persons, the Holy Synod ensured that all of them fulfilled their duties<sup>22</sup>. There were frequent changes in the personnel of the church hierarchy and diocesan administration, which were reflected in the reports of the ober-procurators. Their analysis makes it possible to find out that in 1888, the rector of the Kyiv Theological Seminary, Archimandrite Iryney, was promoted to the rank of bishop and appointed bishop of Uman and second vicar<sup>23</sup> of the Kyiv diocese<sup>24</sup>, and in 1890 he was transferred to the post of bishop of Chyhyryn with the title of the second vicar of the Kyiv diocese. Bishop Anatolii of Ostroh, vicar of the Voronezh diocese, was transferred to the Uman See. He was also appointed the third vicar of the Kyiv Eparchy<sup>25</sup>. In 1892, Bishop Iryney was transferred to the Mohyliv Bishop's See<sup>26</sup>.

<sup>20</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1894 god*, Sankt-Peterburg 1886, p. 4.

<sup>21</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1914 god*, Sankt-Peterburg 1916, p. 95.

<sup>22</sup> T.V. Barsov, *Svyatejšij Sinod v ego proshlom*, Sankt-Peterburh 1896, s. 164.

<sup>23</sup> Vicar is a bishop without an eparchy who assists a ruling bishop and manages a vicariate. Vicariate is an administrative unit of the church that is part of an eparchy.

<sup>24</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1888 i 1889 gody*, Sankt-Peterburg 1891, p. 12.

<sup>25</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1890 i 1891 gody...*, p. 6.

<sup>26</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1892 i 1893 gody*, Sankt-Peterburg 1895, p. 35.

Changes in the hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church took place in the following years. In particular, in 1892, the abbot of the Kyiv Cave Monastery, Archimandrite Yuvenaly, was appointed first Bishop of Balakhna, vicar of the Nizhny Novgorod diocese, and then Bishop of Kursk<sup>27</sup>, and the rector of the Kyiv Theological Seminary, Archimandrite Peter, was appointed Bishop of Sukhumi<sup>28</sup>. In 1896, the vicar of the Kyiv Cave Monastery of the Assumption, Archimandrite Sergius, was appointed Bishop of Uman<sup>29</sup>, the third vicar of the Kyiv diocese, and in 1898 he was renamed as the second vicar of the diocese<sup>30</sup>. In 1902, he was appointed Bishop of Pskov, and the second vicar of the Eparchy of Kyiv, Bishop Dmytro of Chyhyryn, was transferred to the post of Bishop of Tambov<sup>31</sup>. On July 8, 1907, Bishop Platon of Chyhyryn, who at that time was the first vicar of the Kyiv Eparchy, was appointed Archbishop of Aleutia and North America<sup>32</sup>. It was one of the foreign dioceses of the ROC. In addition, on September 16, 1908, the first vicar of the Kyiv Eparchy, Bishop Agapit of Chyhyryn, was appointed Bishop of Vladikavkaz and Mozdok<sup>33</sup>, and on August 13, 1910, the second vicar of the Kyiv Eparchy, Bishop Theodosius of Uman, was appointed Bishop of Orenburg and Turgai<sup>34</sup>.

This list of personnel rotations in the diocesan administration seems to be far from complete. The geography of the movement of priests of all levels testified to the well-thought-out imperial policy of the Russian tsar, namely, the exercise of total control and

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 32.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 34.

<sup>29</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1888 i 1889 gody...*, p. 21.

<sup>30</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1898 god*, Sankt-Peterburg 1901, p. 3.

<sup>31</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1902 god*, St. Petersburg 1905, p. 9.

<sup>32</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1903–1904 gody*, St. Petersburg 1905, p. 72.

<sup>33</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1908–1909 gody*, St. Petersburg 1911, p. 41.

<sup>34</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1905–1907 gody*, St. Petersburg 1910, p. 13.

influence on the population of the regions. If you carefully trace the biography and previous location of the bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church, who were appointed to the post of Metropolitan of Kyiv and Galicia, as well as other lower positions in the diocesan administration, you can observe a steady trend of constant movement of authoritative Ukrainian bishops to Russian, mainly provincial, dioceses and filling Ukrainian dioceses with Russians, respectively.

The published reports of the ober-procurators also provide an opportunity to use the method of prosopography in historical research. They paid attention to personnel issues in the system of synodal and diocesan administration: the appointment of priests, their transfer, ordination, retirement, and obituaries which were published. This information was accompanied by biographical references, thanks to which we can assess the level of priests' education, as well as the position and effectiveness of their activities. In particular, the report dating back to 1903–1904 contains an obituary of Metropolitan Theognost of Kyiv and Galicia, who died on January 22, 1903. Information provided in the obituary confirms our idea about the tendency of the Holy Synod to appoint priests to the highest church positions in Ukraine, meaning the vast majority of them were Russians by nationality and their previous place of service was the chair of the Russian dioceses. The deceased Metropolitan was not an exception. His Eminence Theognost began his pastoral ministry in 1853 in the Novgorod Eparchy, after serving in other Russian eparchies. In 1883 he was appointed Archbishop of the Novgorod Eparchy, and from 1900 to 1903 he headed the Kyiv Eparchy. He was recognized as an archbishop who was actively concerned with the creation of parish schools, fraternities, guardianships, and religious and educational societies in the dioceses entrusted to him. During his tenure as the Metropolitan of Kyiv and Halych, the archbishop made efforts to restore the great church of the Kyiv Cave Monastery<sup>35</sup>.

The study of obituaries reflected on the pages of the reports makes it possible to find out that in the majority of biographies, there was also a “Kyiv period” in their lives<sup>36</sup>. Given the fact that the

---

<sup>35</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonoszeva [...] za 1903–1904 gody...*, p. 50.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 57.

information in the biographies of these people was taken from their files, the degree of confidence in this data only increases.

The reports also provided information on the total number of Orthodox monasteries, monks and novices in the Russian Empire. The analysis of this information makes it possible to note a pattern to their rapid quantitative growth since the mid-1880s. Thus, the report for the year 1884 indicated the existence of 486 monasteries and 195 covents (681 total) in the Empire at that time. There were 7,157 monks and 4,465 novices there. In the covents, there were 5,537 nuns and 14,591 novices<sup>37</sup>. 10 years later, in 1904, there were 508 monasteries with 9,907 monks and 8,104 novices, and 382 covents with 11,870 nuns and 36,559 novices<sup>38</sup>. In 1912, there were already 914 monasteries and covents and 71 bishops' houses<sup>39</sup>. If we look at the social composition, then mainly peasants went to the monasteries, but there were very few people from the merchant or noble classes. The study of statistical data found on the pages of the reports makes it possible to state the fact that in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, there was an increase in the number of women's monasteries. This phenomenon can be explained by the abolition of serfdom, and the undermining of the patriarchal foundations of the peasant family of the post-reform period, which in turn led to a change in the position of women in society.

The appendices to the reports of the ober-procurators are more informative about the number of monasteries and monks in the dioceses. The analysis made it possible to outline the situation in the monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy. Thus, it was found that during the period under study, the diocese had 1 bishop's house and 4 to 6 monasteries. The monks were allowed to stay in them; for example, there were only 75 people between 1883–1884, but in fact, 100 persons lived there<sup>40</sup>. From 1885 onwards, 107 full-time

<sup>37</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1884 god*, St. Petersburg 1886, p. 229.

<sup>38</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1903–1904 gody...*, p. 90.

<sup>39</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1911–1912 gody*, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 104.

<sup>40</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1884 god...*, p. 1.

monks<sup>41</sup> were allowed to stay, but their actual number was much higher. In 1897 the total number reached 778 people<sup>42</sup>.

The number of novices during this period increased from 32 to 842 people. The same pattern was observed with the supernumerary monasteries. Thus, between 1883–1884 there were 9 supernumerary monasteries with 120 monks and 79 novices. In 1897 there were 8 such monasteries and they housed 196 monks and 312 novices. There was also a monastery on the territory of the Kyiv Cave Monastery; according to the staff, 110 monks could be housed, but in reality there were 242 monks and 908 novices in 1883. By 1894 there were 338 monks and 852 novices. Incidentally, among all 4 existing monasteries at that time, the Kyiv Cave Monastery of the Assumption was the largest in terms of the number of monks and novices. For example, according to the same report, the St. Alexander Nevsky Monastery in St. Petersburg had the right to maintain 110 monks, but in reality it had 77 monks and 53 novices; Moscow's St. Sergius Lavra with the Bethany and Makhritsky monasteries and the Gethsemane Skete had the right to maintain 218 monks according to the staff, but in reality there were 209 monks and 96 novices; Pochayiv Assumption Lavra had 45 monks, which corresponded to the state, and 76 novices<sup>43</sup>.

This very period is marked by the rapid development of female monasticism throughout the Russian Empire, which gave scholars reason to assert the "feminization of monasticism" in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. In 1883, the initial year of these reports, there were 2 full-time and 2 part-time nunneries in the diocese. According to the staff it was allowed to keep 58 nuns, and there were in fact 58 nuns and 11 novices in these two staff monasteries. There were 89 nuns and 108 novices in the two supernumerary monasteries. Dating back to 1898, there were 3 full-time and 2 part-time monasteries with a total of 325 nuns and 524 novices<sup>44</sup>.

---

<sup>41</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1885 god*, St. Petersburg 1888, p. 1.

<sup>42</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1896–1897 gody*, St. Petersburg 1898, p. 1.

<sup>43</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1884 god...*, p. 383.

<sup>44</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1898 god...*, p. 1.



The above figures for men's and women's monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy as well as the number of their nuns (as an example of one diocese) show the pattern of their growth until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as mentioned above.

The revival of monastic life was accompanied by the restoration of previously liquidated monasteries, as well as the establishment of new ones, which became possible due to the softening of state policy towards Orthodox monasteries and monasticism. Until the early 80s of the 19<sup>th</sup>-century, monasteries could be opened only after the mandatory approval of the synodal decree of the emperor. From 1881 onwards, it was not required in cases where material support from the state was no longer needed. The abolition of such a strict rule caused a rapid growth of monasteries.

The development of monastic life in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century was carried out in the context of the general rise of the economy of the post-reform period, the rapid development of industry and trade, and the formation of the banking system. There was a restoration and development of Orthodox monasteries, including on the territory of the Kyiv diocese, with the help of significant financial contributions from the merchants and representatives of business circles, their patrons during this period.

Returning to the characteristics of the reports by the ober-procurators of the Holy Synod, it is worth mentioning their quality and the appendices to them. Starting from 1897, the formation of statistical data on the dioceses in terms of the number of monasteries and monasticism was provided without dividing them into regular and non-staff monasteries. The number of their monks and novices was also indicated by the total number, which makes it impossible, without the involvement of additional sources, especially archival ones, to understand their real situation and to track trends in their quantitative composition.

The reports also provided information on the status change of Orthodox monasteries. Thus, in 1884 in particular, by the highest decree, the Kyiv-Mezhyhirya faience factory was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod for the restoration of the previously existing monastery<sup>45</sup>. In 1886, the Kyiv-Mezhyhirya Transfiguration Monastery was elevated to the status of a first-class dormitory monastery including the Kyiv-Trinity Dormitory Monastery in its

---

<sup>45</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1884 god...*, p. 46.



organization as well<sup>46</sup>. It was also allowed to organize charitable and educational institutions there. All this was possible thanks to the presence of the Metropolitan Platon of Kyiv and Halych on the board of the Holy Synod and his active position while dissolving the problems of the diocese.

The growth of the number of nuns and novices in monasteries dictated the need to increase the number of women's monasteries. Therefore, in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, some orders of the Holy Synod concerned the change of some monasteries' status in the Kyiv Eparchy. Thus, in 1903, the Bohuslavskyi Mykolaiv Monastery transitioned to a female monastery and was granted the status of a co-educational monastery<sup>47</sup>. In 1907, the Moshnohirsky Ascension Monastery transitioned to a co-educational monastery, and the Transfiguration Monastery received the status of a second-class monastery<sup>48</sup>. In 1910, Korsun St. Onuphriivsky Monastery transitioned to a female monastery<sup>49</sup>, and in 1911 the Motroninsky Holy Trinity Monastery underwent the same changes<sup>50</sup>.

The reports of the ober-procurators of the Holy Synod are an important informative source for studying the cultural, educational and charitable activities of the Orthodox monasteries in the Kyiv diocese. The report for 1884 provides information about the schools that were fully or partially supported by monasteries. In particular, the Kyiv Cave Monastery of the Assumption maintained three schools at that time: an icon-painting school for up to 30 students, a school at the printing house for 40 students, and a public school for 100 boys. Kyiv-Mykolaiv, Kyiv-Vydubyt-skyi St. Michael's and Kyiv-Saint Trinity monasteries maintained small home schools where children were taught to read and write and even carpentry. The Kyiv-Vydubyt-skyi St. Michael's Monastery kept a shelter for orphaned boys<sup>51</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1886 god*, St. Petersburg 1888, pp. 11–13.

<sup>47</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1903–1904 gody...*, p. 97.

<sup>48</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1905–1907 gody...*, p. 105.

<sup>49</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1910 god*, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 90.

<sup>50</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1911–1912 gody...*, p. 95.

<sup>51</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1884 god...*, p. 234.

In December 1890, a teacher's school was opened at St. Michael's Monastery, where peasant children from the Kyiv province between 15 and 18 years old were admitted after graduating from one- and two-class parochial and folk schools. Every year the monastery spent up to 2,500 rubles on their maintenance<sup>52</sup>. In addition, in the same monastery in 1891, a library with a significant book collection, mainly of religious and moral content, was opened. Its services were available to both parishioners and residents of the city, so this library was in great demand<sup>53</sup>.

The post-reform period in the Russian Empire opened access to education for the female population. In many dioceses, with more or less financially secure nunneries, schools were opened where girls were taught to read and write, church singing and needlework. Such schools were a real salvation for orphans and children from poor peasant families. In addition to education, girls were provided with housing, food and clothing. Wealthy families paid a moderate fee, which compensated for food and accommodation costs for children in the monasteries. For some monasteries that had financial problems and could not maintain such educational institutions on their own, the Holy Synod provided financial assistance. Such institutions were also financially supported by fraternities, local guardianships and zemstvos.

In 1884, in the Kyiv Eparchy, women's schools existed at three monasteries: Kyiv-Florivskiy, Lebedynskiy St. Nicholas and Rzhyschivskiy Preobrazhenskiy. Up to 50 girls, mostly orphans from clergy families, studied in the Kyiv-Florivskiy monastery every year. At the Lebedynskiy St. Nicholas Monastery, there was a six-grade school for 25–30 girls from clergy families who studied there and stayed free of charge. Those who wanted to study there, but did not qualify for free education, paid a reasonable fee and were accepted on such conditions. Up to 25 girls from different classes studied at the school at the Rzhyschiv Transfiguration Convent every year<sup>54</sup>.

The report of 1886 states that there were 170 different educational institutions in all the Orthodox monasteries at that time, of which about 70 were in men's monasteries, where up to 1,350 boys studied, and the rest were in women's monasteries, where 2,650 girls

<sup>52</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1890 i 1891 gody...*, p. 74.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 75.

<sup>54</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1884 god...*, p. 243.

studied, respectively<sup>55</sup>. From the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the cultural and educational activities of monasteries acquired a different quality. Schools at monasteries were usually located in separate specially equipped premises and were maintained at the expense of monasteries. Among the monastery schools, in addition to one- and two-class parochial schools, there were also schools of church-teaching, agriculture, icon-painting, *etc.*

In addition, Orthodox women's monasteries were engaged in extensive charitable activities, which played a much more important role than in men's monasteries. Charitable activities of monasteries were most manifested in the opening and organization of hospitals, pharmacies, almshouses, shelters, houses for pilgrims, *etc.* For a long time, the appendices to the reports of the ober-procurators did not contain statistical data on the number of hospitals and almshouses at the monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy. Starting from 1894, the report contained information about the opening of a hospital at the Kyiv-Pokrovsky Convent in the autumn of 1893 at the expense of Grand Duchess Alexandra Petrovna. This hospital at that time could treat 33 patients simultaneously and was equipped following the requirements of medicine of that time: it had 2 departments – therapeutic and surgical. Later, a gynaecological department was established as well. A polyclinic for Kyiv residents was opened in a separate one-story building from this hospital. In May 1895, a hotel for pilgrims with 200 beds was opened in the same monastery, which had its own kitchen and buffet to serve customers<sup>56</sup>.

From 1901 onwards, the annexes to the reports of the ober-procurators generalized information about the existence of 11 hospitals with a total of 227 beds and 10 almshouses with 254 beds at the monasteries in the Kyiv Eparchy<sup>57</sup>. For comparison, in general, in monasteries throughout the Russian Empire at that time there were 193 hospitals with 2,729 beds and 130 almshouses with 1,785 beds<sup>58</sup>.

---

<sup>55</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1886 god...*, p. 19.

<sup>56</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1894 i 1895 gody*, St. Petersburg 1898, p. 115.

<sup>57</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1901 god*, St. Petersburg 1905, p. 43.

<sup>58</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1902 god...*, p. 35.

The analysis of the reports by the ober-procurators allows us to track the effectiveness of the hospital at the Kyiv-Pokrovsky Monastery over 10 years (1893–1903). During this time, 1,138,747 patients visited the hospital and 20,114 operations were performed, and 1,200,000 prescriptions were released free of charge. At the expense of the amounts allocated for the hospital, a shelter for incurable patients and blind women was also maintained. Up to 50 people were constantly kept here. All of them were served by the sisters of mercy at the monastery<sup>59</sup>. According to the report for 1903–1904, 80 thousand rubles<sup>60</sup> were annually allocated from the state treasury for the polyclinic, hospital and two free shelters at the Kyiv-Pokrovsky Monastery, which was commonly called “The Hospital of Emperor Nicholas II”.

Apart from medical and charitable activities, the Kyiv-Pokrovsk Hospital declared itself as an educational institution. In 1904, women’s courses for caring for the sick and wounded were opened there. These courses were attended by more than 800 people and they turned out to be extremely efficient as sisters of mercy for the Red Cross while providing assistance and help to the wounded on the battlefields of the Russian-Japanese war and the First World War. At the beginning of the latter, a hospital for sick and wounded soldiers with 225 beds was opened at the monastery hospital. At that time, the 40 best doctors in the city and 240 nuns and novices of the monastery worked here as middle and junior medical staff<sup>61</sup>.

At the initial stage of the war, other monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy joined the charitable activity. Thus, the St. Michael’s Golden-Domed Monastery in Kyiv equipped itself at its own expense and provided an infirmary for the use of the military department. The monastery spent 7,300 rubles on the maintenance of this medical unit from October to December 1914. A 120-bed infirmary was also opened at the Kyiv Cave Monastery. By the end of 1914, the Lavra spent about 25 thousand rubles on its maintenance. Aside from that, the Lavra allocated 10 buildings to accommodate up to 2 thousand wounded soldiers. In general, the report

<sup>59</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1914 god...*, p. 121.

<sup>60</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1903–1904 gody...*, p. 98.

<sup>61</sup> *Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosceva [...] za 1914 god...*, p. 124.

of the ober-procurator for 1914 indicated that the largest number of monastery hospitals was opened in the Petrograd (360 beds) and Kyiv (356 beds) dioceses<sup>62</sup>.

Thus, the author's study of the published reports by the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church between 1884–1914 contributes to the expansion of the source base of the historical research. The use of these reports' information potential by historians will increase the cognitive value of further scientific works. The published historical sources in general, which include the reports by the ober-procurators of the Holy Ruling Synod, are an important source for the study of the relationship between the state and the Orthodox Church in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The structure of the reports and the materials presented in them provide opportunities to characterize the organizational peculiarities of the synodal system and diocesan administration, the personnel of the clergy, and the activities of individual priests of the Orthodox Church. The reports provide extensive information about the clergy of the Kyiv Eparchy, the number of monasteries, and their cultural, educational and charitable activities. The analysis of the summarized statistics of the number of dioceses of the Russian Empire, churches and monasteries, and the results of their activities in the given chronological period, leads to the conclusion that the Kyiv diocese occupied a leading place in the system of the Russian Orthodox Church and was of particular importance in the social history of Ukraine in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

## **Bibliography**

### **PRINTED SOURCES**

*Institut rukopisu NBUV*, f. 174, op. 2, spr. 3365–3407.

*Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossijskoj imperii*, sobranie 2-oe, St. Petersburg 1830–1881, vol. X, ch. 2, no. 42701.

*Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1884 god*, St. Petersburg 1886.

*Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1885 god*, St. Petersburg 1888.

---

<sup>62</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 26, 29.

- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1886 god*, St. Petersburg 1888.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1888 i 1889 gody*, Sankt-Peterburg 1891.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1890 i 1891 gody*, Sankt-Peterburg 1893.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1892 i 1893 gody*, Sankt-Peterburg 1895.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1894 i 1895 gody*, St. Petersburg 1898.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1896–1897 gody*, St. Petersburg 1898.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1898 god*, Sankt-Peterburg 1901.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1894 god*, Sankt-Peterburg 1886.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1901 god*, St. Petersburg 1905.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1902 god*, St. Petersburg 1905.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1903–1904 gody*, St. Petersburg 1905.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1905–1907 gody*, St. Petersburg 1910.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1908–1909 gody*, St. Petersburg 1911.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1910 god*, St. Petersburg 1913.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1911–1912 gody*, St. Petersburg 1913.
- Vsepoddannejšij otchet Ober-prokurora Svyatejšhego sinoda K. Pobedonosczewa po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniya za 1914 god*, Sankt-Peterburg 1916.



**SECONDARY LITERATURE**

- Barsov T.V., *Sviateishyi Synod v eho proshlom*, Sankt-Peterburh 1889.
- Bezhanidze H.V., Fyrsov A.H., *Ober-prokurory Sviateisheho synoda o synodalnoi systeme tserkovnoho upravleniia*, "Vestnyk Istorycheskoho obshchestva Sankt-Peterburhskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii" 2021, no. 1(6), pp. 41–50.
- Fyrsov S.L., *Otchety ober-prokurorov Sviateisheho Pravytelstvuiushcheho Synoda epokhy ymperatora Nykolaia Pavlovycha kak ystochnyk po istorii Pravoslavnoi Rossyiskoi Tserkvy*, "Khrystyanskoie chtenie" no. 5, pp. 179–199.
- Kukuruza A.V., *Dukhovni akademii v kintsi XIX – na pochatku XX st. (za zvitamy Ober-prokurora Sviatiishoho Synodu)*, "Intelihentsiia i vlada, Seriia: Istoriiia" 2015, no. 33, pp. 22–36.
- Lavrinenko N.P., *Sotsialno-ekonomichne stanovyshche ta kulturno-osvitnia diialnist pravoslavnykh monastyriiv pivdnia Kyivskoi yeparkhii (1793–1917 rr.)*, avtoref. dys. kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.01 – istoriia Ukrainy, Cherkasy 2008.
- Opria I.A., *Pytannia relihiinoi istorii Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy druhoi polovyny XIX – pochatku XX st. u zvitakh ober-prokurora Sv. Synodu*, "Visnyk Kamianets-Podilskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. Ivana Ohienka, Istorychni nauky" 2015, no. 8, pp. 77–84.
- Petrenko A.A., *Mytropolyt Kyivskiy i Halytskyi Platon (Horodetskyi): administratyvna, relihiino-prosvitnytska ta misionerska diialnist*, dys. kand. ist. nauk: 07.00.01 – istoriia Ukrainy, Kyiv 2016.
- Prykhod'on O., *Povnovazhennia y orhaanizatsiini zminy v strukturi Sviatiishoho synodu v druhi chverti XIX st.*, "Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka, Ser. Istoriiia" 2014, no. 1, ch. 2, pp. 110–115.
- Sviashchenko Z., *Kyivska yeparkhiia u zvitakh ober-prokuroriv Sviatiishoho synodu (1884–1916 rr.)*, "Eminak" 2020, no. 3(31), pp. 80–87.
- Shylov D.N., *Hosudarstvennye deiateli Rossyiskoi ymperyy: Hlavy vysshykh y tsentralnykh uchrezhdenyi. 1802–1917: Byobyblyohr. sprav*, Sankt-Peterburh 2001.
- 

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

**Associate Prof. Oleksandr Chuchalin** – Associate Professor of the Department of Ukrainian History of Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, Ukraine. Candidate of Historical Science (2018), Associate Professor (2019). Author of 40 publications, one monograph. Member of the editorial board of scientific journal "Consensus". Member of the National Union of Local Historians of Ukraine.

**Research interests:** History of the Orthodox Church in the Ukrainian lands, regional history of Ukraine, religious tourism in Ukraine, scientific biography.



aleksandr02.1989@gmail.com