

## ІСТОРИЧНІ НАУКИ

УДК 94(477.8):327

**Lastovskiy V.,**  
Doctor of Historical Sciences, professor,  
Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts  
(Ukraine, Kyiv), lastov@ukr.net

**ORTHODOX CHURCH AS AN INSTRUMENT  
OF RUSSIAN PRESSURE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS  
AT THE END OF XVIII CENTURY**

*In this article discusses the use of the international life of the late eighteenth century, the religious factor as a way of political pressure in the relations between Russia and Poland. The first Russia's victim on this way became the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. And one of the methods that were used by Russia and its allies was a pressure in solving the problem of the dissidents using the activity of the Orthodox Church. Victor Sadkovsky who in 1780s and 1790s became one of the central figures in international relations between Russia and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Perhaps, his activity, by the plan of organizers the creation of pereyaslav-borispol' diocese on the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth territory, had to play the same role as the activity of the famous abbot of Matronynsky Monastery – Melhisadeck Znachko-Yavorsky on the eve of the popular uprising in 1768. The only difference was that in this case it had to be much controlled and with the clearly expected result, but not vice versa.*

**Keywords:** international relations, Orthodox Church, Russia, Poland, Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, clergy, monasteries, Right-bank Ukraine.

*(стаття друкується мовою оригіналу)*

During the Seven Years' War (1756–1763) Russia as a state for the first time had an opportunity, even unsuccessful, to influence international policies in Europe and to be one of its determining factors. In future this role will be gradually strengthened by finding adequate influential allies and creating strong pressure on its neighbors. The first Russia's victim on this way became the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. And one of the methods that were used by Russia and its allies was a pressure in solving the problem of the dissidents using the activity of the Orthodox Church.

Since 1755 the role of the outpost in this case had played the bishop George Koninssky (1717–1795), who became the Belarusian archbishop in 1783. But his activity was rather limited by territorial bounds. That is why it needed the strengthening. In 1785 the restructuring of Orthodox Church structures in Ukraine was made and a new system was created. Centre of the active Church life was moved to the right-bank Ukraine. Victor Sadkovsky (1741–1803), pereyaslav-borispol' bishop, became the active, initiative and energetic organizer of the new social and political situation.

So, on March 27, 1785 by the special decree of the Empress Catherin II, which was supported by the Senate on March 31, it was decided to eliminate the old pereyaslav-borispol' diocese at the left-bank Ukraine as a part of church-territorial and independent structure, which had existed from 1700. From that moment bishopric with the same name was created but just at the right-bank Ukraine and Belarus, and now as a vicariate of Kyiv Metropolis. Formally, the sense of such reorganization and rearrangement was to conduct church boundaries to

provincial boundaries. But the case of Pereyaslav diocese was completely different. It has been taken out of borders of its state and has been completely placed at the neighboring territory. Saving of the name (although the new diocese has anything common neither with Pereyaslav, nor with Borispol; its centre situated in Slutsk!), obviously had to be a link between Polish territories at the right-bank Ukraine and Russian at the left-bank, to create the appearance of saving traditions and connection (as the former diocese had its territories on the right-bank in the early years of XVIII century and gradually expend them). Chernihiv diocese didn't approach for this role because it had never related to the Right-bank and in such case its political destiny would immediately bursts upon the eye. Kiev diocese didn't approach too just from a purely practical side because there was needed active archbishop in place, but not in Kiev, to solve persistent problems with border crossing. And the previous decades experience had shown the inability of controlling foreign territories of the diocese in this format. Creating absolutely new diocese made no sense for few reasons: countering polish authorities, new unnecessary costs, not enough number of trained professional priests and the necessity still earning the trust and understanding of the local orthodox population. All it would have taken quiet long process, but there was no time. That is why the easiest and fastest way to solve problems was the reorganizing of pereyaslav-borispol' diocese with subordination of Kiev.

Victor Sadkovsky, the Archimandrite of Slutsk Trinity Monastery, became the head of the new diocese [18, c. 72–74; 24]. Under his ownership was the whole right-bank part of Kiev Metropolis and former territories at the Left-bank were given to the direct department of Kiev (10 archpriests and 4 monasteries). In such way the allotment was made and Russian authorities achieved two goals. Firstly, to simplify the administrative management all church structure now really corresponded to the boundaries of Kiev, Chernihiv and Nowograd-Seversky governorships established in 1782. Secondly, on the right-bank Ukraine, which was still owned by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, was created one new structure that was supposed only to strengthen a pressure on the already shattered state. Polish historian J. Bartosiewicz (1821–1870) quite reasonably noted this fact as fatal to the subsequent history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth [27, c. 283].

But in the middle of 1780's pereyaslav-borispol' diocese itself was in tough condition. Although considerable parts of Right-bank Ukraine and Belorussia were encompassed in it's territory, in fact just a small number of settlements were included in it's establishment. According to the data of historian I. Pokrovskiy in 1785 only around 100 Orthodox churches yielded to the bishop Victor Sadkovskiy and by the year of 1787 – around 300. The situation with monasteries wasn't better. Though theirs' quantity was not less than

38, but many of them were in rather desolated state. In August of the same year Father Superior of Preobrazhenskiy Slutskiy monastery asked the metropolitan the permission to stay permanently in any of the Ukrainian monasteries (Lebedinskiy, Boguslavskiy or Vinogradskiy monasteries) as his own was in decline. Thus the bishop wrote in his letter, dated from June 23, 1786, to the Metropolitan of Kiev Samuil Mislavskiy (1731–1796) that in Nikolaev Bel'skiy monastery there were no «brothers or superiors for a long time, «and in one of the Drogichenskiy monasteries due to the devastation «no one can fulfill the liturgy». Bogoyavlenskiy Pinskiy, Onufrievskiy Yablochenskiy and other monasteries were in the same condition. Describing the state of his diocese, Sadkovsky Victor himself noted, for example, that not only did not the monks in many monasteries understand, but also did not know how to read and write in Russian, and in parish churches priests were careless to the documentation (metric and other books) or did not engage it at all, moreover, even in some spiritual rules «were not able to make a decent report and write wrong issues due to these instructions» [13, c. 1718]. Naturally, this situation required a response and action from both Slutskaya Spiritual Consistory and the Kyiv Metropolis. In June 1786, Victor Sadkovsky was going to send a letter to abbots of Ukrainian monasteries with the purpose of sending «honest monks» from there to Slutsk for positions in an abandoned monasteries, and in February 1787 he also asked the Metropolitan of Kiev to send quicker the celibate priest Gabriel Janowski from St. Michael's Kiev Monastery to replace the deceased Father Superior Jason Revutsky from the Epiphany Pinsky monastery [13, c. 1710, 1721; 8, арк. 3]; in 1788, the Father Superior Cyprian from Preobrazhenskiy Slutskiy monastery asked the bishop to sent literate monks as in his monastery of «seven-days ministration other monastic obediences can be done almost by no one,» so on July 26 an order was made in the Holy Office to send the celibate priest Gerontius from Onufrievsky Jabotinsky monastery and the monk Izmaragd from St. George's Lebedinsky monastery [3, арк. 2–23в].

But even such movements couldn't always help and couldn't change the situation considerably. This was prevented by two circumstances: firstly, the diocese's territory was too large that significantly reduces the possibility of the pulpit really influences the local priesthood; secondly, constant pressure on this orthodox priest from the polish administration, landowners, Catholics and Greek-Catholics.

Borders of the diocese weren't determinate. Even Bishop Victor Sadkovsky couldn't identify them exactly. In his letter to Kiev metropolitan from September 8, 1786, comparing his diocese with entities in Russia, he wrote that any diocese isn't more than province, and «my expands as well as Poland so far away as Dnister from Dvina and borders of Silesia from Dnieper». Therefore, openly declared the bishop, there wasn't any opportunity to gather complete information about priesthood's condition at places and with some monasteries for connection «neither male, nor even an occasion» [13, c. 1717, 1718]. The last fact stimulated Victor Sadkovsky to make the audit trip to monasteries of Naddniproshyna, but the first of them made a painful impression. Crossed the border on September 1, 1787 the Bishop stopped at Trahtemirivsky Holy Cross

Monastery (more precisely, at place where it used to be). Now there were situated Border Customs with relevant polish services and two monks (one of them called himself an abbot) lived not far away «under the mountain, in a cave» [321, c. 137–138].

The inspection of more ten monasteries was delayed for almost a year due to the bishop illness. To Slutsk he returned only in October 1788 [18, c. 102].

Although it was only the inspection tour (at least, officially), in any way it had a real influence on further destiny of the Bishop and on a course of interconfessional relations inside Poland. Obviously, there was something that political elite of Russia hoped could happen, creating a new diocese in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Direct after Victor Sadkovsky's trip it began to spread different rumors which goal was to discredit the one orthodox bishop in Poland. He was attributed to purposes to raise the local Ukrainians to the revolt, to create new Koliyivshyna [18, c. 114–115]. This thought got implanted in later polish historiography. For example, T. Korzon in 1906 wrote that Victor Sadkovsky had agitated Ukrainians to the riot as it had made before Melhisadeck Znachko-Yavorsky [30, c. 35].

However, it should be noted that the whole situation had the grounds – that policy which was adopted in Ukraine by Russian authorities through Ukrainian priesthood. Pro-Russian decrees, manifests and orders were sent round the diocese from Theological Consistory in Pereyaslav. For example, on January 29, 1789 in Chihirin Spiritual Government print manifests were received for spreading to local parishes, and was about: Russian triumph over Swedes, Princess Katherine Pavlovna's successful birthday, receiving forgiveness to all fugitives from Russian army, capture of the Ochakov fortress with the command to send a thanksgiving service with genuflection on March, 13 [4, л. 10 об., 12]. By mentioning of Russian historian V. Klyuchevsky (1841–1911), at those times Russian policy about orthodox population in Ukraine wasn't directed to strengthen the orthodoxy in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth or to equalize it in rights with greek-catholics and catholics so far as «strengthened too much orthodoxies become independent from us» [9, c. 49]. As well the highest dioceses' hierarchy took care about increasing its' influence on the parish priesthood. In June 1787 the Bishop Victor Sadkovsky issued the edict that prohibited from that moment admits to the priesthood priests located in Walachia [5, арк. 4–5 зв]. In such way the diocese absolutely deprived priests a possibility to maneuver between dioceses and in interconfessional relations. It should be also mentioned about Potemkin's plan in November 1789 in case of war between Prussia and Austria to commit Russian troops to Eastern region of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth relying on orthodox population of these places [22, c. 234].

Step-by-step, rumors about the preparing revolt developed into the confidence and papers started to write openly about it in Warsaw [19, c. 72]. At the beginning of May 1789 Father Superior of the Holy Spirit monastery in Vilensk Varlaam Shishatskiy wrote in his letter to Archbishop of Mogilev George Konissky about this subject: «...now, when there are rumors in Poland as though Greek not Uniate spiritual people of the same faith are rebelled and like that there are prepared knives and other thievish

weapons began to infringe and persecute our spiritual» [13, c. 1727]. In the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth the panic started literally that noted contemporaries of these events [28, c. 205–207]. Indeed, in future exactly these events have pushed the Polish society the policy on orthodox dissidents and have sounded already frank appeals for the introduction of belief's freedom for Ukrainians and the creation internal national orthodox church with the possibility studying in theological seminaries and even in universities [28, c. 207].

For the meantime, the repressive measures against the Orthodox clergy did not take long. On March, 10, 1789 the cornet of «national cavalry» Stanislav Obertinsky and ten armed men captured the Korsunsky Onufrievsky Monastery and hegumen «shaken up the whole cell and trunks and then fraternal cells, bakery and the House... entered the church shaken up all trunks and looked under thrones finding weapons or copies or powder but did not find...» [10, c. 357–358; 23, апк. 1–2]. After returning to the department from the Nikolas Grozovsky Monastery the bishop Victor Sadovsky was arrested with two members of the Spiritual Consistory of Slutsk. Approximately the same dates general searches were conducted at monasteries of the Holy Spirit in Vilensk and Saints Peter and Paul in Minsk during which «even graves were opened» [13, c. 1727].

During the following months pursuits of the orthodox priesthood have reached considerable scales in the state. After the bishop were arrested 22 consistory servants and other representatives of the priesthood including prefect of the Slutsk seminary Korbut, archpriest Ioan Bilozor, the abbot of the Nikolas Monastery in Medvedovsk Vissarion and others [12, c. 141; 18, c. 128–142; 27, c. 291]. Staying in prison for many of them dragged on for a good while. For example, Victor Sadkovsky himself was released from the fortress of Czestochowa only on July 21, 1792 [15, c. 733–737], and the abbot Vissarion wrote about himself in his letter to the bishop that he had spent in prison whole three years [13, c. 1732–1733].

That day, when Victor Sadkovsky was arrested (April 18), the Seim of confederation in Warsaw issued the resolution for all white and black orthodox priesthood to swear fealty to the kingdom in two weeks. The place of presence in Ukraine to confirm one's loyalty became Zhitomir. But in next six months polish authority was obliged to change terms of the oath and to allow its implementation in that towns which had the magdeburg courts (for example, Zhabotin, Smela etc.) that was called by the delaying of this action by the orthodox clergy [12, c. 142]. A similar direction in the name of commissioners of the Kyiv district was issued in Smela on October 22, 1789 [17, c. 222]. But even the realization of these conditions didn't release the priesthood from pursuits and unlawful acts. Therefore a part of priests emigrated to the Russian territory, and in Chihirin eldership the prince's of Yabluniv commissioner let for sale «gifts» of eight church livings [12, c. 144].

These repressions against Polish orthodox clergy in the end of 80s – early 90s of 18<sup>th</sup> century undoubtedly should be united with attempts of polish administrative bodies to limit the influence of the Russian policy on the local population through church's structures. The evidence is the fact that the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth's

government in 1790–1791 tried to create such organization of the Orthodox Church in its state which would be under full administrative and ideological control. To do this, planned to convene a congress of priesthood on May 1, 1791 in Slutsk but then it was postponed to May 15 in Pinsk. According to the project that was approved by the Warsaw Seim it was proposed to create archbishopric with the centre in Belsk and three subordinate episcopates in Zhitomir and Minsk [20, c. 372–376].

Meanwhile on May 3 in the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth appeared the Constitution – the document that was called to renovate and to streamline present social relations [26]. The first article of this act proclaimed that the Catholicism is the official religion in Poland. Relative to other rites and religions they received some liberties in consideration of the Christian principle of love for neighbors [29, c. 56]. In the modern Belorussian historiography some researchers perceive negatively this Polish Constitution. Particularly, M. Yermalovich considers that it was a direct threat to Byelorussian, Ukrainian and Lithuanian nations because in the document was pronounced about the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth as the single unitary state and about whole population as the united nation; the researcher interpret this act as an assimilative document which purpose was to create united polish nation in future [6, c. 423]. However, it should be noted that the author obviously overstates the situation and transfers it on polish ideological motivations of XVI–XVII centuries and even looking back at the Russian and Soviet ideology.

In 1791 at the church council (congregation) in Pinsk were presented 45 members of the Orthodox Clergy from pereyaslav–borispol' diocese and 51 representatives of the secular population, besides delegates from Greek–catholic and polish administration also took part [20, c. 378–383]. Decisions of the congregation even though they were adopted in course of policy of the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, in fact, were directed to the creation the independent from the St. Synod structure of the Orthodox Church at the right–bank Ukraine and Byelorussia that was expressed in giving preference to Patriarch of Constantinople, and creating own consistory and other authorities [19, c. 43–44; 20, c. 416–424]. On June 16, Irinarch Balanovsky, archimandrite of the Holy Trinity Motroninsky Monastery, was elected the rector of the congregation [20, c. 384]. The last fact, apparently, is the evidence that Motroninsky Monastery in 1790s continued playing a considerable consolidation role (probably carrying a symbolic character) among the Orthodox population of the Right–bank, but not so outstanding as in 1760s.

In my opinion, decisions of the congregation really had properties of the autonomy against Russian power–holding structures and were quite social progressive that theoretically could promote the formation and development of the autonomy Ukrainian Orthodox Church in future. But, in any way, this process was interrupted by the second partition of the Poland in 1793. About how unprofitable was positive solution of «dissident question» for the ruling circles of Russia indicate the letter written by G. Potemkin to Katherine II in 1790, which was introduced to the scientific circulation by V. Smoliy in 1978 (it said: «The Poles pay attention on this important for them subject.

Russia is very necessary to keep it without any action» and the instruction to Y. Bulgakov, the new ambassador in Warsaw, to keep this question under control and in every way impede possible positive progresses [19, с. 116–117]. This phrase wasn't accidental and was said not by the irresponsible politician in a burst of passion. There is what famous Russian diplomat and politician N. Panin (1718–1783) wrote to another famous diplomat and politician N. Repnin (1734–1801) on August 14, 1767: «... the main rule that was original and now is, and a priori has to be obligatory guide for all our purposes and feats», and exactly «to realize dissident issue not for dissemination our and protestant beliefs in Poland but once and forever to take part in all Polish proceedings through our brothers in faith and protestants as solid and reliable party with the legitimate right» [25, с. 261].

On March 27, 1793 General-in-chief M. Krechetnikov (1729–1793), a commander of Russian troops, that was brought to Poland, officially announced about the annexation of Kyivshchyna, Podolia, Volyn and West Byelorrussia to Russia, that automatically put the Orthodox Clergy of this lands under the full jurisdiction of St. Sinoda [16, с. 354; 18, с. 154–155]. The new authority at the right-bank Ukraine and Byelorrussia instantly reorganized church structures as Russian. The decree of the 13 of April, 1793 Victor Sadkovsky, who was released from the imprisonment, became a leader of the new independent Minsk, Iziaslav and Bratslav diocese, and a post of the bishop of Pereyaslav and Borispol according to the same decree and to the decree of the 4 July 1793 as the coadjutor of the Kiev metropolis was transferred again to Ascension Convent in Pereyaslav [11, с. 132; 15, с. 737–738]. After the last partition of Poland there was no necessity of such church structure at the right-bank Ukraine and it was eliminated. Since that time the bishop of Pereyaslav and Borispyl haven't played any more or less considerable role in the political life of Ukrainian society. He became an ordinary hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church and he was assigned parishes of only two districts – Pereyaslav and Borispyl [15, с. 738–739]. In 1799 this diocese was renamed to Little Russian/Malorossia–Pereyaslav (existed till 1803) as independent regular unite of the Russian church structure [1, с. 213].

So it could be argued that the activity of the bishop Victor Sadkovsky and his diocese in Pereyaslav and Borispyl passed in the channel of the political life and was used at the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century as one of Russian authorities' pressure instruments on Polish society and policy in international relations between Russia and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth.

#### References

1. Амвросий. История Росийской Иерархии. Часть I. – М., 1807. – XI, 646, 5 с.
2. Барановский С. Минско–Волынский архиепископ Виктор Садковский // Волыньские епархиальные ведомости. – 1878. – №3. – С.134–146.
3. Державний архів Черкаської області. – Ф.149. – Оп.1. – Спр.52.
4. Там само. – Ф.660. – Оп.2. – Спр.5.
5. Там само. – Оп.1. – Спр.54.
6. Ермалович М. Беларуская дзяржава Вялікое княства Літоўскае. – Мн., 2000. 448 с.
7. Ефименко П. Образцы обличительной литературы в Малороссии // Киевская старина. – 1882. – №3. – С.538–559.

8. Институт рукопису Національної бібліотеки України ім. В. Вернадського. – Ф.232. – №465.

9. Ключевский В. Сочинения. Т.5. – М., 1989. – 478 с.
10. Корсунский Онуфриевский монастырь // Киевские епархиальные ведомости (onwards – КЕВ). – 1867. – №11. – С.351–364.
11. Крижанівський О., Плохий С. Історія церкви та релігійної думки в Україні. Кн.3. – К., 1994. – 336 с.
12. Л-в П. Виктор, епископ Переяславский и Бориспольский, архимандрит Слуцкого монастыря, коадьютор Киевской митрополии // КЕВ. – 1861. – №5. – С.135–148.
13. Памятники православия и русской народности в Западной России в XVII–XVIII вв. Т. I. Часть 1–3. – К., 1905. – CLXIV, XCVII, 1771, CXIX с.
14. Письмо из Чернигова о тамошних новостях 1801 г. // Киевская старина. – 1890. – №1. – С.539–540.
15. Покровский И. Русские епархии в XVI–XIX вв., их открытие, состав и пределы. Т.2. – Казань, 1913. – 892, XVIII с.
16. Полонська–Василенко Н. Історія України. – К., 1992. – Т.2. – 608 с.
17. Приложение к статье о Викторе, епископе Переяславском // КЕВ. – 1861. – №7. – С.216–223.
18. Рункевич С. История Минской архиепископии (1793–1832 гг.). – СПб., 1893. – XVI, 572, XXXVIII с.
19. Смолій В. Возз'єднання Правобережної України з Росією. – К., 1978. – 192 с.
20. Состояние православной церкви в Польше, по взятии преосвященного Виктора под арест в Варшаву // КЕВ. – 1861. – №12. – С.372–385; №14. – С.414–425.
21. Состояние украинских церквей и православного духовенства в конце 18 века, по донесению Св. Синоду от Виктора, епископа переяславского, коадьютора митрополии киевския // КЕВ. – 1873. – №5. – С.131–153.
22. Стегний П. Разделы Польши и дипломатия Екатерины II. 1772. 1793. 1795. – М., 2002. – 696 с.
23. Центральний державний історичний архів України у м. Києві. – Ф.916. – Оп.1. – Спр.2.
24. Черниговские иерархи // Труды Киевской Духовной Академии. – 1860. – №2. – С.272–273.
25. Чечулин Н. Внешняя политика России в начале царствования Екатерины II. 1762–1774. // Записки историко-филологического факультета Императорского Санкт-Петербургского университета. Часть XL. – СПб., 1896. – VII, 468, IV с.
26. Bartoszewicz K. Konstytucja 3 Maja (Kronica dni kwietniowych i majowych w Warszawie w r. 1791). – Warszawa, 1906. – 155 s.
27. Bartoszewicz J. Szkiz dziejów Kościoła Ruskiego w Polsce. – Kraków, 1880. – 496 s.
28. Homola Dzikowska I. Pamiętnik historyczno–polityczny Piotra Switkowskiego 1782–1792. – Kraków, 1960. – 274 s.
29. Konstytucja 3 Maja 1791 // Konstytucja 3 Maja 1791 / Wprowadzenie naukowe J. Bardach. – Warszawa, 2001. – S.55–79.
30. Korzon T. Historia nowocześnie. 1788–1805. – Warszawa, 1906. – 632 s.
31. Likowski E. Dzieje kościoła unickiego na Litwie i Rusi w XVIII i XIX wieku. – Poznań, 1880. – 495 s.

#### References

1. Amvrosij. Istorija Rosijskoj Ierarhii. Chast' I. – М., 1807. – XI, 646, 5 s.
2. Baranovskij S. Minsko–Volynskij arhiepiskop Viktor Sadkovskij // Volynskie eparhial'nye vedomosti. – 1878. – №3. – С.134–146.
3. Derzhavnyj arhiv Cherkas'koi' oblasti. – F.149. – Op.1. – Spr.52.
4. Tam samo. – F.660. – Op.2. – Spr.5.
5. Tam samo. – Op.1. – Spr.54.
6. Ermalovich M. Belaruskaya dzarzhava Vialikoe knastva Litovskae. – Mn., 2000. – 448 s.
7. Efimenko P. Obrazcy oblichitel'noj literatury v Malorossii // Kievskaja starina. – 1882. – №3. – S.538–559.
8. Instytut rukopysu Nacional'noi' biblioteki Ukrainy im. V. Vernad'skogo. – F.232. – №465.
9. Kljuchevskij V. Sochinenija. T.5. – М., 1989. – 478 s.
10. Korsunskij Onufrievskij monastyr' // Kievskie eparhial'nye vedomosti (onwards – КЕВ). – 1867. – №11. – С.351–364.
11. Kryzhaniv's'kyj O., Plohij S. Istorija cerkvy ta religijnoi' dumky v Ukraini. Кн.3. – К., 1994. – 336 с.

12. L-v P. Viktor, episkop Perejaslavskij i Borispol'skij, arhimandrit Sluckogo monastyrja, koad#jutor Kievskoj mitropolii // KEV. – 1861. – №5. – S.135–148.
13. Pamjatniki pravoslavija i ruskoj narodnosti v Zapadnoj Rossii v XVII–XVIII vv. T. I. Chast' 1–3. – K., 1905. – CLXIV, XCVII, 1771, CXIX s.
14. Pis'mo iz Chernigova o tamoshnih novostjah 1801 g. // Kievskaja starina. – 1890. – №1. – S.539–540.
15. Pokrovskij I. Russkie eparhii v XVI–XIX vv., ih otkrytie, sostav i predely. T.2. – Kazan', 1913. – 892, XVIII s.
16. Polons'ka–Vasylenko N. Istorija Ukrai'ny. – K., 1992. – T.2. – 608 s.
17. Prilozhenie k stat'e o Viktoro, episkope Perejaslavskom // KEV. – 1861. – №7. – S.216–223.
18. Runkevich S. Istorija Minskoj arhiepiskopii (1793–1832 gg.). – SPb., 1893. – XVI, 572, XXXVIII s.
19. Smolij V. Vozz'jednannja Pravoberezhnoj' Ukrai'ny z Rosijeju. – K., 1978. – 192 s.
20. Sostojanie pravoslavnoj cerkvi v Pol'she, po vzjatii preosvjashhennogo Viktora pod arest v Varshavu // KEV. – 1861. – №12. – S.372–385; №14. – S.414–425.
21. Sostojanie ukrainskih cerkvej i pravoslavного duhovenstva v konce 18 veka, po doneseniju Sv. Sinodu ot Viktora, episkopa perejaslavskogo, koad#jutora mitropolii kievskija // KEV. – 1873. – №5. – S.131–153.
22. Stegnij P. Razdely Pol'shi i diplomatija Ekateriny II. 1772. 1793. 1795. – M., 2002. – 696 s.
23. Central'nyj derzhavnyj istorychnyj arhiv Ukrai'ny u m. Kyjevi. – F.916. – Op.1. – Spr.2.
24. Chernigovskie ierarhi // Trudy Kievskoj Duhovnoj Akademii. – 1860. – №2. – S.272–273.
25. Chechulin N. Vneshnjaja politika Rossii v nachale carstvovanija Ekateriny II. 1762–1774. // Zapiski istoriko-filologicheskogo fakul'teta Imperatorskogo Sankt–Peterburgskogo universiteta. Chast' XL. – SPb., 1896. – VII, 468, IV s.
26. Bartoszewicz K. Konstytucja 3 Maja (Kronica dni kwietniowych i majowych w Warszawie w r. 1791). – Warszawa, 1906. – 155 s.
27. Bartoszewicz J. Szkiz dziejów Kościoła Ruskiego w Polsce. – Kraków, 1880. – 496 s.
28. Homola Dzikowska I. Pamiętnik historyczno–polityczny Piotra Switkowskiego 1782–1792. – Kraków, 1960. – 274 s.
29. Konstytucja 3 Maja 1791 // Konstytucja 3 Maja 1791 / Wprowadzenie naukowe J. Bardach. – Warszawa, 2001. – S.55–79.
30. Korzon T. Historia nowoczesna. 1788–1805. – Warszawa, 1906. – 632 s.
31. Likowski E. Dzieje kościoła unickiego na Litwie i Rusi w XVIII i XIX wieku. – Poznań, 1880. – 495 s.

*Ластовський В., доктор історичних наук, професор, Київський національний університет культури і мистецтв (Україна, Київ), lastov@ukr.net*

#### **Православна Церква як інструмент тиску Росії у міжнародних відносинах наприкінці XVIII століття**

*Досліджується використання у міжнародному житті кінця XVIII ст. релігійного фактору як способу політичного тиску у стосунках між Росією та Річчю Посполитою. Один з методів, використаний Росією і її союзниками, був тиск у вирішенні т.зв. проблеми дисидентів, з використанням діяльності Православної Церкви. Одним із центральних фігур у 1780-х і 1790-х років в міжнародних відносинах між Росією і Річчю Посполитою став єпископ переяславський і бориспільський Віктор Садковський. Можливо, його діяльність, за задумом організаторів створення Переяславсько–Бориспільської спархії на території Речі Посполитої, повинна була б відіграти ту ж роль, як і діяльність відомого настоятеля Мотронинського монастиря – Мельхіседека Значко–Яворського напередодні народного повстання в 1768 році. Єдиною відмінністю від попередньої ситуації було те, що в цьому випадку події повинні було розвиватися під контролем російської влади з явно очікуваним результатом, а не навпаки.*

*Ключові слова:* міжнародні відносини, Росія, Польща, Україна, Православна Церква, духовенство, монастирі, Правобережна Україна.

\* \* \*

УДК 94(477)«18»

**Гедін М. С.,**  
кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії  
України і туризмознавства,  
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет  
(Україна, Київ), maks300011@yandex.ru

#### **Вплив слов'янофільства на суспільно–політичну думку середини XIX століття**

*Проаналізовано історію зародження, становлення та сутність слов'янофільства як суспільно–політичної течії в Російській Імперії і конкретно–історичного явища суспільної думки першої половини – середини XIX століття, а також його вплив на українську історичну та суспільно–політичну думку середини XIX століття. Показано, що витоки слов'янофільства треба шукати на початку XV століття, коли в суспільстві активно обговорювалися дві основні проблеми – відношення церкви до ереси і занепад моралі в монастирях. На початку XVI століття висувається ідея Москви як третього Риму, яка протягом XVI століття перетворюється в панівну ідеологію Російської держави під назвою – «Москва – Третій Рим». Вплив її відсутності цієї теорії знайшли своє відображення в ідеях слов'янофілів в середині XIX століття. Зазначається, що слов'янофільство виробило своєрідну ідею історичного розвитку Росії, а також знайшло відображення в поглядах і діяльності українських вчених.*

*Ключові слова:* слов'янофіли, слов'янофільство, слов'янофільська ідея, XIX століття, громадське життя.

Початок XIX століття в Російській Імперії був знаковою епохою. Правління Олександра I, переможні битви Великої Вітчизняної війни 1812 року, успіхи російської політики у Європі, ряд реформ і нова система законодавства, ініційовані М. М. Сперанським, поява таємних товариств та очікування соціальних змін – усе це змінило суспільно–політичні погляди і думки громадськості. І навіть розгром повстання декабристів в 1825 році і розправа Миколи I над його провідними діячами кардинально не вплинули на зміну поглядів народу [10, с. 110]. Наслідком цих процесів став початок періоду жорсткої політичної реакції, що викликав новий поворот у зміні суспільно–політичних поглядів панівних громадських течій. В цей час домінують суспільно–політичної і філософської думки в країні стало ставлення Російській Імперії до Європи.

За таких неоднозначних історичних обставин в середині XIX століття в Російській імперії починається протистояння двох потоків історії – «східного і західного». А оскільки російський народ ніколи не був суто європейським чи суто азіатським народом, то у російській душі боролися двоє начал, східне і західне. Найбільш чітке теоретичне і громадсько–політичне оформлення ці дві тенденції отримали в 30–60-х роках XIX століття. Першу тенденцію представляли слов'янофіли, а другу західники. Представники цих двох суспільно–політичних течій в активних наукових дискусіях відстоювали свої погляди на минуле, нинішнє та майбутнє Російської Імперії. За визначенням харківського історика О. Д. Капліна, це була епоха «порушення розумових інтересів і початку кардинальних змін в суспільно–політичному житті Російської Імперії» [8, с. 45].

Актуальність пропонованої статті пояснюється тим, що так зване слов'янофільство («класичне», «істинне») належить до найбільш значних явищ суспільно–політичної думки XIX століття, яке помітно вплинуло на богословські, філософські, історичні теорії та погляди. На кінець 1970-х рр. стало очевидним, що ґрунтовне дослідження слов'янофільства як багатоаспектної наукової проблеми можливе за участю представників майже всього циклу гуманітарних наук.