

Polish Factor in the Policy of the Russian Power in Right-Bank Ukraine (the End of the Eighteenth Century – 1830s)

Abstract. The purpose of the research is to clear up the forms of relations of the imperial center with the Polish elites on the territories acquired by Russia, to identify the peculiarities of the tsarist governments policy regarding their influence in Right-Bank Ukraine at the end of the eighteenth century – in the 1830s. **Research methodology.** A number of special historical research methods have been used in the article: comparative, procedural, political-legal, temporal, problem-chronological, content-analysis, prosopographic, hermeneutical, and others. **Scientific novelty.** The dynamics of solving "Polish issue" by the ruling upper circles headed by Emperors Paul I, Alexander I, and Nicholas I in the context of identifying specific institutional forms and means of integration of the Right-Bank territories into the Russian Empire have been clarified. **Conclusions.** It has been established, that, within the indicated chronological limits, the patterns of the Imperial centers relations with the Polish elites on the Right-Bank lands developed from a tolerant attitude towards the Polish influence on the social-political development of the region to a consistent policy of unification and depolonization of the annexed territories. During the reign of Paul I, the General Court, district-county and nobility courts were re-established on the territories joined after the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and instead of marshals of the nobility, the positions of provincial and county marshals and cornets were introduced. It has been confirmed that All-Russian legal rules and the Lithuanian Statute co-existed on the Right-Bank territories at that time. Under Alexanders I reign the tolerant attitude to the Polish influence on the Right-Bank lands continued, which implied a combination of imperial unification policy with the recognition of regional peculiarities and historical identity of the annexed territories. It has been noted that fundamental changes in the "Polish issue" occurred during the reign of Nicholas I, after the revolutionary events in European countries and, first of all, the November uprising of 1830. It has been determined that from that time the policy of the Russian government regarding the Poles in the Right-Bank provinces was pursued in several directions: attracting the Polish nobility to the Russian elites by incorporating it into the social category of nobility and conferring appropriate rights and privileges; the repressions against Polish patriots; transferring the vast majority of minor-landed Polish gentry to taxable social categories; conducting judicial reform, under which town courts were liquidated and mandatory use of the Russian language was introduced in legal proceedings; limiting the conditions of existence of the Roman Catholic Church; depolonization and russification of educational-cultural space. It has been confirmed that the changing the policy to the Polish population on the Right-Bank territories in the 1830s fully corresponded to the strategic tasks of the imperial policy of centralization and unification in the sphere of state administration, in the legal and social-cultural space expressed in the ideologeme "autocracy, orthodoxy, people".

Keywords: Russian Empire, Poland, Right-Bank Ukraine, administrative-territorial division, judicial reform, depolonization, russification.

The activity of higher and central bodies of state power, the apparatus of territorial administration of the South-Western region was stipulated by a set of circumstances connected with the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Rzeczpospolita) and the process of integrating the Right-Bank Ukrainian lands into the Russian Empire. The level of their social-economic development, ethnic-cultural and social composition of the population, the degree of the local elites loyalty to the power and the existing relations with the imperial center differed significantly. In solving the “Polish issue”, the tsardom went from a tolerant attitude to the Polish cultural influence on the social-political development of Russia to the policy of strict russification of the annexed territories.

The proposed article is a logical continuation of studies on the history of the Right-Bank Ukraine conducted by such contemporary foreign and Ukrainian scientists¹. The works of these authors laid the methodological foundation of new approaches to studying complex, full of contradictions processes of the Right-Bank Ukraine’s development during the specified period. The purpose of our article is to analyze the evolution of the tsarist governments policy concerning the forms and methods of integration of the Polish gentry from the Right-Bank Ukraine into the Russian Empire at the end of the eighteenth century – in 1830s.

The entry of the Right-Bank Ukraine to the Romanov Empire directed the vector of its social-political development toward the Russian influence. The policy of the central and territorial power there was determined by the competition for spheres of influence between the Russian autocracy and Polish aristocracy that owned most of the lands together with serfs. The small Polish gentry, who suffered from mass separation from its own class, the peak of which took place in the 1830–1840s, was affected by this struggle most of all. The governments policy was predetermined by the social category character of that time Russian society, the exclusive place of the nobility in the governing structures, the desire of the supreme power to preserve the “purity” of the ruling stratum, to prevent the impoverished Polish gentry from administration.

After the death of the Empress Catherine II on November 6, 1796, her successor Paul I, by a number of laws, shifted the policy of accelerated unification of the region to a more moderate one. At the end of that year, the Emperor sent the Senate the edict signed by him: “On the setting free of people who were punished, imprisoned and exiled after riots in Poland”². According to the following act, the Poles, who voluntarily returned to places of their residence, were free to join military service³.

¹ Бармак М.В. Формування російської імперської системи державної служби на українських землях (XVIII–XIX ст.) – Тернопіль, 2016. – 392 с.; *Бовау Д.* Шляхтич, кріпак і ревізор: Польська шляхта між царизмом та українськими масами (1831–1863) / Пер. з фр. З.Борисюк. – К., 1996. – 415 с.; *Його ж.* Російська влада і польська шляхта в Україні: 1793–1830 рр. / Пер. з фр. З.Борисюк. – Л., 2007. – 296 с.; *Горизонтов Л.Е.* Парадокси імперської політики: поляки в Росії і русские в Польше (XIX – начало XX в.). – Москва, 1999. – 272 с.; *Гудь Б.* Загибель Аркадії: Етносоціальні аспекти українсько-польських конфліктів XIX – першої половини XX ст. – Л., 2006. – 448 с.; *Його ж.* З історії етносоціальних конфліктів: Українці й поляки на Наддніпрянщині, Волині й у Східній Галичині в XIX – першій половині XX ст. / Пер. з пол. А.Панчишин. – Х., 2017. – 490 с.; Западні окраини Российской империи / Под ред. М.Д.Долбилова, А.И.Миллера. – Москва, 2006. – 608 с.; *Кривошея І.І.* Еволюція дворянства Правобережної України наприкінці XVIII – початку XX ст. (за матеріалами Київської губернії): Дис. ... канд. іст. наук. – Умань, 1997. – 268 с.; *Його ж.* Шляхта Уманщини в імперську добу (кінець XVIII – перша половина XIX ст.). – Умань, 2017. – 168 с.; *Лисенко С., Чернецький Є.* Правобережна шляхта (кінець XVIII – перша половина XIX ст.). – Вид. 2-ге, випр. та доп. – Біла Церква, 2007. – 448 с.; *Поліщук Ю.* Національні меншини Правобережної України у контексті етнічної політики Російської імперії (кінець XVIII – початок XX ст.). – К., 2012. – 492 с.; *Павлюк В.* Магнатерія Волині в соціально-економічному та культурному житті Правобережжя у XIX ст. – Острогож, 2000. – 184 с.; *Філіпчук А.Г.* Правобережна Україна наприкінці XVIII – на початку XIX ст.: тенденції розвитку і соціальні трансформації. – Кам’янець-Подільський, 2010. – 727 с.; *Шандра В.С.* Генерал-губернаторства в Україні: XIX – початок XX ст. – К., 2005. – 427 с.; *Щербак Н.О.* Національне питання в політиці царизму у Правобережній Україні (кінець XVIII – початок XX ст.). – К., 2005. – 616 с. та ін.

² Полное собрание законов Российской империи (ПСЗ РИ). – Собр.1-е. – Т.XXIV. – Санкт-Петербург, 1830. – №17585.

³ Там же. – №17625.

The edict “On the restoration in the Malorossiya (Little Russia) of administration and legal proceedings in accordance with the local rights and traditional rites” of November 30, 1796⁴ was the confirmation of consistency of the policy pursued by Paul I, not only in the South-Western region, but also in other Ukrainian regions. In accordance with administrative-territorial division, the General Court, district-county (*zemskiy-povit*) and nobility (*pidkomorskiy*) courts were restored on the Ukrainian territories, however, the provincial magistrates, upper court (court of the second instance) and lower courts (courts in counties) were abolished. On February 6, 1797 by the Imperial edict, in Malorossiya, Kyiv, Podillia, Volyn, Minsk and Byelorussian provinces, it was allowed to introduce the positions of provincial and county marshals and cornets instead of the marshals of the nobility⁵.

On the petition of the infantry general, Kamianets-Podilskiy military governor and Malorossian governor-general O. Bekleshov, the Senate edict was issued on September 23, 1797, allowing district-county and nobility courts, as well as magistrates to conduct legal proceedings in Polish, and use two languages, Polish and Russian, in the main courts in such a way that all resolutions and sentences were written in Polish on one side and in Russian on the other one⁶. It was significant that the right to vote was granted to the landless Polish gentry.

The division of the population into taxable and privileged social categories became the logical consequence of including the annexed Right-Bank territories in the financial system of the Russian Empire. A considerable part of the funds that came to the State treasury from the South-Western territory was made of taxes from physical persons. Instead of the traditional “chimney money” (tax from a separate house) “head money” (tax from each person) was introduced on the Right-Bank part, the collection of which began from January 1, 1797 in accordance with Catherine’s II provisions of the Manifesto dated July 13, 1795⁷. The edict of Paul I on the need of the legal registration by each new citizen of the Empire of his (her) social status, which was associated with the performance of corresponding duties, was of paramount importance. The mentioned regulations were spread to all the joined Right-Bank territories⁸.

For some time, the laws of the Russian Empire and the provisions of the Lithuanian Statute were simultaneously acting on the territory of the South-Western lands, which often led to legal conflicts. For example, in 1799, there was a case when the accused party rejected the decision of Starodub county court on the grounds that a certain action had been taken in accordance with the statute law, and therefore was outside the jurisdiction. At the appeal to the county court from the judge, “signed and stamped by him, two court officials and witnesses from the Polish nobles, about the disobedience against the sentence of the court”, the Senate in its decision of December 25, 1799 resolved the following: “Both in the Malorossiya governorate-general and in others provinces [...] one must act in accordance with the general national regulations”⁹. However, because of different circumstances, the decision was not implemented till certain time.

The period of Alexander I reign (1801–1825), as well as during the reign of his father Paul I, was characterized by moderateness as to the Polish influence on the South-Western territories, since the ruling upper circles tried to rely on the Polish nobility in matters relating to the governing of the annexed territories. According to most scholars, during the first period of his reign, the young Emperor was almost exclusively occupied with “the destruction of

⁴ Там же. – №17594.

⁵ Там же. – №17790.

⁶ Державний архів Волинської області (Держархів Волинської обл.). – Ф.363. – Оп.1. – Спр.10. – Арк.207–207 зв.

⁷ ПСЗ РИ. – Собр.1-е. – Т.ХХІІІ. – Санкт-Петербург, 1830. – №17356.

⁸ Держархів Волинської обл. – Ф.363. – Оп.1. – Спр.10. – Арк.246.

⁹ Там само. – Ф.486. – Оп.2. – Спр.1. – Арк.31.

everything that had been done by his father – the abolition of his laws, the correction of harm made by him”¹⁰. In particular, Alexander I restored the elections of the nobility representatives, freed the clergy from physical punishment. First of all, in 1801 he liquidated the Secret expedition of Catherine II and passed all its functions to local authorities. Instead, the Ministry of Internal Affairs was created by him the following year, which was centrally in charge of political and criminal investigation and censorship¹¹. The declining of the ban as to the Western fashion, cancelling powdered braids for soldiers, etc. were also among the decisions.

In a series of manifestos in early April 1801, Alexander I reaffirmed the privileges and charters to the nobility and towns of 1785, and also abolished all the laws contradicting them. In particular, the edict of March 30, 1800, was abolished; it concerned more severe punishment of the Polish nobility, who refused service jobs after elections of the nobility of the county or province, or began late performing their duties late; the edicts of December 4, 1796 and March 6, 1801, as to the abolishment of the nobilities genealogy book registration and termination of the authority of noble assemblies to consider, approve the evidence of noble origin and to issue charters to persons who did not fully prove their noble origin, the edict of August 16, 1798, forbidding smallholders to prove their noble rights were abolished as well. As a result, “the nobility of the Russian Empire and also unacknowledged Polish nobility from the Right-Bank provinces returned to clear social category organization with standardized procedures of recognizing nobility rights and their applying”¹².

By the definition of modern Russian historians, from the very beginning of his reign, Alexander I tried to combine the imperial unification of ruling the former eastern parts of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth with the recognition (often silently) of their regional and historical peculiarities¹³. For example, the organization of the police service in the Right-Bank provinces had its own specifics, which consisted in organic combining the activities of the national and local authorities, and local institutions, which remained from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and confirmed their practical expediency (for example, such was the institute of county headmen). However, in 1800, by the order of the commission of senators who visited Zhytomyr for inspecting Volyn province, on the grounds that the positions of county headmen “did not fit” in the staff list, the latter were abolished. But life showed the necessity of such position for rural territories, so in 1808 the Volyn governor M. Komburley appealed to the Minister of Internal Affairs, Prince A. Kurakin, to restore such time-tested county police body. This problem was reported to Emperor Alexander I, who decided that it was necessary to comply with the request of the Volyn governor on the grounds that, in accordance with the edict of 1724, county headmen were elected in the counties of Grodno province. These positions were resumed, “as they had existed before 1800”¹⁴.

The evidence that in the near future the authorities did not intend to change radically the legal system on the joined territories, was the publication in 1810 in St. Petersburg of the book personally approved by the Emperor¹⁵. The international situation at that time was extremely complicated, which could not but affect the policy of the Russian power authorities inside the country. The victory of the French Revolution

¹⁰ История XIX века / Под ред. Э.Лависса, А.Рамбо; пер. с фр. – Т.2: Время Наполеона: 1800–1815. – Ч.2. – Москва, 1938. – С.134.

¹¹ История полиции дореволюционной России // Сборник документов и материалов по истории государства и права / Отв. ред. В.М.Курицын. – Москва, 1981. – С.34.

¹² Лисенко С., Чернецкий С. Правобережна шляхта (кінець XVIII – перша половина XIX ст.). – С.28–29.

¹³ Западные окраины Российской империи. – С.94.

¹⁴ Держархів Волинської обл. – Ф.486. – Оп.1. – Спр.14. – Арк.395–396.

¹⁵ Ручной словарь, или Краткое содержание польских и литовских законов, служащих руководством в судебных тяжбах всякого рода, собранных для употребления в присутственных местах и для пользы частных обывателей коронных и литовских провинций / Пер. с пол. – Санкт-Петербург, 1810. – XV, 382 с.

and coming to power of Napoleon I Bonaparte, who in 1799 became the First Consul of the French republic and in 1804 the Emperor of France, set new priorities in the world politics. Under the terms of the Treaty of Tilsit in 1807, Napoleon founded the Duchy of Warsaw that year, and by the decision of the Vienna congress of the states-winners of Napoleon (1815), Kingdom of Poland was created, which maintained the hope of restoring Polish statehood among patriotic circles in Poland.

The above mentioned circumstances, as well as the danger of bringing “revolutionary contagion” from Europe, intensified the struggle of the supreme power authorities with the opponents of the Russian autocracy within the country. For example, on August 24, 1809, Alexander I issued the edict “On punishment for unauthorized going abroad”¹⁶. The nobles, who went abroad without permission prior to issuing that edict, were given a six-month period to return home, otherwise their estates would be confiscated. A huge list of confiscated Polish estates left by their owners was the evidence that unauthorized going abroad became widespread (a 400-page volume was made up by the Ministry of Finance from 1809 to 1913; the majority of estates – 44 belonging to the rich Polish nobles and 35 – to small Polish gentry – was confiscated in Volyn)¹⁷. The Senate edict of April 4, 1816, according to which business trips to the Kingdom of Poland were not considered business trips abroad was a significant step towards integrating the Polish lands into the Russian Empire; at the same time, the edict had a symbolic meaning¹⁸.

The period of the first quarter of the nineteenth century was distinguished by the relative harmony in the relations between the central authorities and large Polish landowners, which is evidenced by the occupation of high state positions by the representatives of the Polish aristocracy. For example, “a close friend” of Emperor Alexander I Prince A. Czartoryski, a Polish patriot, in 1802–1806 occupied the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs; he was also the patron of the Vilno educational district, directing his efforts to all-round development of the Polish culture on the territories, which in the past had been part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Recollecting those times, the Prince wrote in his memoirs: «A few years later, all Poland was filled with schools in which the Polish national feelings could develop freely. [...] At that time, no one was surprised at my efforts; only later the Russian society was indignant with me, but at first the Emperor generously protected me. It goes without saying that I used the positive attitude of His Majesty and directed all my efforts at peoples education, to which I gave the national character”¹⁹.

The positions of Volyn civil governor and vice-governor were held by such influential Polish nobles as B. Giziński and F. Plater. Taking advantage of Alexander I liberalism, Polish public figures actually managed that in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, the Right-Bank Ukraine became the center of developing Polish education and culture²⁰. The explanation of such sympathy of the supreme power authorities to the Polish nobility was the fact that this noble society “was united by a peculiar family spirit and a sense of civilizational entity. Their lifestyle combined elegance with conservatism, luxury with cosmopolitanism. The national identity there did not have the significance, which would be acquired in the decades to come”²¹.

¹⁶ ПСЗ РИ. – Собр.1-е. – Т. XXX. – Санкт-Петербург, 1830. – №23806.

¹⁷ Бовуа Д. Російська влада і польська шляхта в Україні: 1793–1830 рр. – С. 178, 182.

¹⁸ Держархів Волинської обл. – Ф. 486. – Оп. 1. – Спр. 36. – Арк. 178.

¹⁹ See: Горизонтов Л. Е. Механизмы формирования украинской и белорусской наций в российском и общеславянском контексте (дореволюционный период) // На путях становления украинской и белорусской наций: факторы, механизмы, соотношения. – Москва, 2004. – С. 88–89.

²⁰ Щербак Н. О. Особливості національної політики російського уряду на Правобережній Україні наприкінці XVIII – початку XIX ст.: Автореф. дис. ... д-ра іст. наук. – К., 2006. – С. 17.

²¹ Бовуа Д. Російська влада і польська шляхта в Україні: 1793–1830 рр. – С. 22.

Under the guidance of A.Czartoryski, T.Czacki started working as a visitor (inspector) of the schools of Volyn, Podillia and Kyiv provinces. He was the founder of Kremenets gymnasia – “the Polish cultural fortress, the only center for the whole Polish Ukraine”²², the person who left a prominent mark in the development of education in the provinces. According to some evidences, 126 elementary schools, as well as county schools, were opened with his direct participation in Volodymyr-Volynskiy, Liubar, Berdychiv, Ovruch, Zhytomyr, Bar, and Vinnytsia²³. His activities were later evaluated by both Russian and Polish public figures and scholars. For example, in 1912, the Orthodox priest P.Antonovich wrote: “Czacki did more for Poland than its kings had done for centuries, and made unforgettable harm to Volyn and the Russian cause”²⁴.

At the same time, the incorporation of the small Polish gentry into the Russian social space was the urgent problem that awaited its solution. Throughout most of Alexander’s I reign “the problem of the Polish nobility status remained stagnant. Its radical solution or non-solution would equally have had negative consequences given the border situation of the Right-Bank provinces and the urgency of the Polish issue in the European politics. As a result of this problem, the small Polish gentry became a hostage and main social defendant in the period of political upheavals of 1825–1826 and 1830–1831”²⁵.

Appreciating in general the period of Alexander’s I reign one can agree with the opinion of scholars who believe that those were the years of liberal searches and constitutional dreams, great administrative experiments, granting broad autonomy to the annexed western parts of the Empire that became part of it after the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. At the same time, it was the period of creating a territorial-sector system of government, which generally met the requirements of the time²⁶.

Instead, Emperor Nicholas I was determined as to the unification of social-political and cultural life of the Empire. The severity of the situation was extremely added by the Decembrist uprising. Only in Volyn province, 20 Polish nobles, mostly from Zhytomyr, were arrested. The provincial marshal of the nobility P.Moshynskiy, S.Karvytskyi and others were among them²⁷. However, a decisive role in changing the vector of politics was played by revolutionary events in European countries, and especially the Polish national (November) uprising of 1830–1831. After its suppression, the Russian emperor issued the Organic statute under which some democratic rules of the Constitutional Charter of 1815 of the Kingdom of Poland were abolished (in particular, the Sejm legislative body) and its lands became an integral part of the Russian Empire. Worried about raising the level of the national consciousness of the Poles during the November uprising, the authorities closed a large number of Catholic monasteries.

The consequences of the uprising affected the social policy of the Russian autocracy concerning certain categories of the population of the Empire’s western outlying districts. It was explained by the fact that the main driving force of the uprising was the minor-landed Polish gentry of the Kingdom of Poland and the territories joined to Russia, especially its south-western lands. The repressive measures of the tsarist government against the uprising participants hurt this particular social group: property was confiscated from some of them, others were exiled to Siberia, and a large number of the Polish nobles were declassified.

²² Там само. – С.230.

²³ Даниляк П.Г. Тадеуш Чацький та його роль у розвитку освіти на Правобережній Україні // Український історичний журнал. – 2009. – №2. – С.57.

²⁴ See: Єршова Л.М. Жіноча освіта на Волині. – Житомир, 2006. – С.48.

²⁵ Лисенко С., Чернецький Є. Правобережна шляхта (кінець XVIII – перша половина XIX ст.). – С.41.

²⁶ Лысенко Л.М. Губернаторы и генерал-губернаторы в Российской империи (XVIII – начало XX в.). – Москва, 2001. – С.27.

²⁷ Петров Н.И. Вольны: Исторические судьбы Юго-Западного края. – Санкт-Петербург, 1888. – С.257.

At the same time, the government encouraged the migration of able-bodied people from the Kingdom of Poland and the annexed territories to other regions of the Russian Empire.

In the opinion of D. Beauvois, the uprising became only the occasion for the liquidation of the minor-landed Polish gentry as a social category. As he pointed out, the materials of the Commission for investigating the uprising, created by the edict of July 10, 1831, gave grounds to consider that the number of rebels in the three Right-Bank provinces almost never exceeded 200 people per county. "There were undoubtedly more insurgents in Volyn and Podillia, but the total number of 10 thousand people seemed to be the most possible figure for the three provinces. However, the poor Polish gentry clearly prevailed: 400 people in Kyiv district, 19 landowners and 55 peasants and vagrants among them... But in no case did this number of participants justify the scale of the repressions, which fell on the impoverished Polish gentry"²⁸. According to the Soviet historiography, the majority of the uprising participants in the Right-Bank Ukraine – 4017 out of 5627 persons – were landowners and the Polish nobles, and only 1273 were peasants²⁹.

For years, the Russian government pursued the policy directed against minor-landed Polish gentry to regulate its social status and assimilate with the social categories existing in the Empire: by a broad inspection of the Polish nobles who could not prove their noble origin, they were transferred to a taxable category. Those measures were substantiated and defined in a number of approved documents: the edict of October 19, 1831 and the subsequent "Imperially Established" provisions of the Committees of Ministers on the affairs of the Western provinces of December 1, 1831, October 11, 1832, March 7, and July 2, 1833, and the Senate edicts of July 25, 1833, February 5 and September 25, 1834, which established the order of "inspecting the Polish nobility" (referring to a complex of administrative measures, aimed at decreasing the number of nobility) and determining its rights in the status of citizens and smallholders of the western provinces³⁰.

Among them the Imperial edict of October 19, 1831 "On the inspection of the Polish nobles in the western provinces, and on the arrangement of such people" should be mentioned. As it was noted in the act, "the recent events in the provinces returned from Poland proved that people there, because of the lack of settled life, property and the way of life of many of them, were most prone to rebellions and criminal actions against the legitimate power"³¹. The edict separated the nobility into two groups: those who were able to confirm their noble origin and were approved by the Heraldic Office, and those who failed to do so, and they were recorded in specially created groups of smallholders and citizens belonging to taxable groups of population. Accordingly, their duties included paying taxes and performing public duties.

According to the Russian legislation and legal procedure, from that time, the former Polish nobles began to be called the nobility. Thus, those who did not prove their noble origin were divided into two categories: rural and urban citizens. It was the rural residents who were to be regarded as smallholders. A certain category of educated people of the so-called "free" professions, such as teachers, doctors, artists, lawyers, and others, were transferred to the category of honorary citizens. One year was given to be assigned to a definite category, after which it was envisaged to treat those people who did not properly legalize their social status "as vagrants"³².

²⁸ Бовуа Д. Шляхтич, кріпак і ревізор... – С.145.

²⁹ История Украинской ССР: В 10 т. – Т.4: Украина в период разложения и кризиса феодально-крепостнической системы. Отмена крепостного права и развитие капитализма (XIX в.). – К., 1983. – С.125.

³⁰ Довідка про діяльність ревізійних комісій для розгляду дій дворянських депутатських зібрань в Київській, Подільській і Волинській губерніях. 31 березня 1839 р. // Київський центральний архів давніх актів: 1852–1943: Зб. док. у 2 т. – Т.1: 1852–1921. – К., 2002. – С.49.

³¹ ПСЗ РИ. – Собр.2-е. – Отд.2. – Т.VI. – Санкт-Петербург, 1832. – №4869.

³² Там же.

Later on, commissions including the Crown representatives were created to inspect the actions of previous commissions, and later a commission to control those inspectors was formed. In particular, in the document of inspecting commissions activity of 1839, it was emphasized that the commissions, established in Kyiv, Podillia and Volyn provinces, “could assess neither the confidence that the nobility had been endowed by the government by creating those commissions, nor the importance of the task and, having been taken by the idea to conceal the abuse of deputies assemblies by indulgent attitude and personal sympathies, did not meet the expectations of the government in these matters at all”³³.

In addition, in 1833, the government created special commissions in the Right-Bank provinces, which were supposed to regulate the keeping and storing parish and civil registers, since there were cases of forgery and falsification of documents to prove noble origin. In December 1833, the Edict of His Imperial Majesty to the Senate signed by Nicholas I “On the establishment of special commissions for considering parish and civil registers in the provinces joined from Poland” was issued³⁴. At last, the purposeful policy of the Russian power authorities regarding this category of the Polish population achieved the desired result: out of 410 000 potential Polish nobles, more than 340 000 were declassified³⁵.

In the autumn of 1831, a special Commission was created by the order of the Emperor, and later a Committee in the affairs of the Western provinces headed by the Chairman of the State Council and the Committee of Ministers V.Kochubei. He was ordered to “bring all the western lands to conformity with the Great Russian provinces in all spheres of life”³⁶. The elimination of the Polish judicial-administrative system in the Right-Bank Ukraine was one of the decisive means of depolonization of the western outlying districts of the Russian Empire. In the rescript of the Emperor Nicholas I to the Senate dated October 30, 1831 “On giving all governmental establishments and officials in the western provinces those names which are accepted in the Great Russian provinces”. The rescript referred to the replacement of the Polish names of public offices by the Russian ones.

The reformation of the court also took place: the town courts were liquidated, and district-county courts were renamed into district (uyezd) courts. The appointment of advisors to provincial boards was carried out by the military governor in coordination with the ministries, and the appointment of district police inspectors and chiefs of the town police – by the civilian governor³⁷. Also, the positions of judges and their assistants in the nobility court, marshals, and cornets, which were not known by the Russian state structures, were abolished. However, by the time of concluding the Code of laws of the Western provinces, the Lithuanian Statute was permitted. The introduction of compulsory using the Russian language in legal proceedings, first in Kyiv and from June 1, 1832 – in Podillia and Volyn provinces was also one of the effective measures to limit the Polish influence in the Right-Bank Ukraine³⁸.

In the context of the administrative and legal unification of the annexed territories, the following Imperially Established edicts should be considered: the Provisions of the Committee of Ministers of February 5, 1831 “On the replacement of the Magdeburg Law in Malorossiya by the Lithuanian Statute and general Russian legislation”³⁹; the

³³ Довідка про діяльність ревізійних комісій для розгляду дій дворянських депутатських зібрань в Київській, Подільській і Волинській губерніях. 31 березня 1839 р. – С.49.

³⁴ ПСЗ РИ. – Собр.2-е. – Отд.1. – Т.VIII. – Санкт-Петербург, 1834. – №6644.

³⁵ Бовуа Д. Шляхтич, кріпак і ревізор... – С.195.

³⁶ Субтельний О. Україна: історія / Пер. з англ. Ю.І.Шевчука. – К., 1991. – С.191.

³⁷ ПСЗ РИ. – Собр.2-е. – Отд.2. – Т.VI. – Санкт-Петербург, 1832. – №4894.

³⁸ Шандра В.С. Генерал-губернаторства в Україні: XIX – початок XX ст. – С.273.

³⁹ ПСЗ РИ. – Собр.2-е. – Отд.1. – Т.VI. – Санкт-Петербург, 1832. – №4319.

edict “On the introduction in the Belorussian provinces The institution for the governing of provinces of the All-Russian Empire and the termination of the Lithuanian Statute” of February 18, 1831⁴⁰, as well as the abolishment of the Magdeburg Law in Kyiv and the introduction of the generally accepted order of town administration there.

Thus, from the time of incorporating the Right-Bank Ukrainian regions into the Romanov Empire after the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, there was a gradual but steady process of adapting the annexed lands to the rules and cultural traditions existing in Russia. At the same time, legal rules and mechanisms adequate to the local conditions for governing the territories were being searched and worked out. The solution of the so-called “Polish issue” was carried out in several directions: including the large Polish nobility in the Russian elites by incorporating it into the nobility, giving it the rights and privileges of the Russian nobility; initiating repressions against Polish patriots; transferring most minor-landed Polish gentry to taxable social categories; limiting the conditions of functioning the Roman Catholic Church; depolonization and russification of the education.

Apparent contradictions were noted in the Russian governmental policy concerning the Polish nobility. Those contradictions were stipulated by the task of building up a centralized state, the necessity to involve the Poles to the local government, and at the same time the willingness of the power to limit the influence of the Polish nobility on the social-political, social-economic, and cultural life of the western regions of the Empire. The governments of Paul I and Alexander I were sure that the model of ruling that had functioned in the central Russian provinces from 1775 required significant corrections for the annexed territories taking into account their local traditions. The simultaneous existence of the elements of several legal systems such as the legal rules and traditions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Russian imperial legislation, etc. demonstrated that policy. Instead, changing the policy concerning the Polish population under Nicholas I generally corresponded to the strategic objectives of the imperial policy of centralization and unification of the cultural-national policy of the Russian Empire, expressed in the ideologue: “autocracy, orthodoxy, people”.

REFERENCES

1. Barmak, M.V. (2017). *Formuvannia rosiiskoi imperskoi systemy derzhavnoi sluzhby na ukrainskykh zemliakh (XVIII–XIX st.)*. Ternopil. [in Ukrainian].
2. Bovua, D. (1996). *Shliakhtych, kripak i revizor: Polska shliakhta mizh tsaryzmozom ta ukrainskymy masamy (1831–1863)*. Transl. Z.Borysiuk. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
3. Bovua, D. (2007). *Rosiiska vlada i polska shliakhta v Ukraini: 1793–1830 rr.* Transl. Z.Borysiuk. Lviv. [in Ukrainian].
4. Danyliak, P.H. (2009). Tadeush Chatskyi ta yoho rol u rozvytku osvity na Pravoberezhnii Ukraini. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 2, 51–66. [in Ukrainian].
5. Dolbilov, M.D., Miller, A.I. (Eds.). (2006). *Zapadnye ukrainy Rossijskoj imperii*. Moskva. [in Russian].
6. Filiniuk, A.H. (2010). *Pravoberezhna Ukraina naprykintsi XVIII – na pochatku XIX st.: tendentsii rozvytku i sotsialni transformatsii*. Kamianets-Podilskyi. [in Ukrainian].
7. Gorizontov, L.E. (1999). *Paradoksy imperskoj politiki: polyaki v Rossii i russkie v Polshe (XIX – nachalo XX v.)*. Moskva. [in Russian].
8. Gorizontov, L.E. (2004). Mekhanizmy formirovaniya ukrainskoj i belorusskoj natsij v rossijskom i obshheslavjanskom kontekste (dorovyutsonnij period). *Na putyakh stanovleniya ukrainskoj i belorusskoj natsij: faktory, mekhanizmy, sootneseniya*. Moskva. [in Russian].
9. Hud, B. (2006). *Zahybel' Arkadii: Etnosotsialni aspekty ukrainsko-polskykh konfliktiv XIX – pershoi polovyny XX st.* Lviv. [in Ukrainian].
10. Hud, B. (2017). *Z istorii etnosotsialnykh konfliktiv: Ukrainci i poliaky na Naddniprovschchyni, Volyni i u Skhidnii Halychyni v XIX – pershii polovyni XX st.* Transl. A.Panchyshyn. Kharkiv. [in Ukrainian].
11. Kryvosheia, I.I. (1997). *Evolutsiia dvorianstva Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy naprykintsi XVIII – pochatku XIX st. (za materialamy Kyivskoi hubernii) (Candidates thesis)*. Uman. [in Ukrainian].
12. Kryvosheia, I.I. (2017). *Shliakhta Umanshchyny v impersku dobu (kinets XVIII – persha polovyna XIX st.)*. Uman. [in Ukrainian].
13. Lysenko, L.M. (2001). *Gubernatory i general-gubernatory v Rossijskoj imperii (XVIII – nachalo XX v.)*. Moskva. [in Russian].
14. Lysenko, S., Chernetskyi, Ye. (2007). *Pravoberezhna shliakhta [kinets XVIII – persha polovyna XIX st.]* (2th ed). Bila Tserkva. [in Ukrainian].
15. Polishchuk, Yu. (2012). *Natsionalni menshyny Pravoberezhnoi Ukrainy u konteksti etnichnoi polityky Rosiiskoi imperii (kinets XVIII – pochatok XX st.)*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
16. Pavliuk, V. (2000). *Mahnateriia Volyni v sotsialno-ekonomichnomu ta kulturnomu zhytti Pravoberezhzhia u XIX st.* Ostroh. [in Ukrainian].

⁴⁰ Там же. – №4369.

17. Shandra, V.S. (2005). *General-hubernatorstva v Ukraini: XIX – pochatok XX st.* Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
 18. Shcherbak, N.O. (2005). *Natsionalne pytannya v politytsi tsaryzmu u Pravoberezhnii Ukraini (kinets XVIII – pochatok XX st.)*. Kyiv. [in Ukrainian].
 19. Yershova, L.M. (2006). *Zhinocha osvita na Volyni*. Zhytomyr. [in Ukrainian].

Валерій Бортніков

кандидат історичних наук,
 професор кафедри політології та державного управління,
 Східноєвропейський національний університет ім. Лесі Українки
 (Луцьк, Україна), bortnikov.v@gmail.com
 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0991-4047>

Алла Бортнікова

докторка політичних наук,
 професорка кафедри всесвітньої історії,
 Східноєвропейський національний університет ім. Лесі Українки
 (Луцьк, Україна), allabortnikova@icloud.com
 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8132-1935>

Наталія Павліха

докторка економічних наук,
 професорка кафедри міжнародних економічних відносин та управління проектами,
 Східноєвропейський національний університет ім. Лесі Українки
 (Луцьк, Україна), pavlixa2@gmail.com
 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5191-242X>

Польський чинник у політиці російської влади у Правобережній Україні (кінець XVIII ст. – 1830-ті рр.)

Анотація. Метою дослідження є з'ясування форм відносин імперського центру з польськими елітами набутих Росією територій, виявлення особливостей політики царського уряду щодо їх впливу на Правобережній Україні наприкінці XVIII ст. – у 1830-х рр. **Методологія дослідження.** У статті використано низку спеціальних історичних методів: компаративний, процесуальний, політико-правовий, темпоральний, проблемно-хронологічний, контент-аналіз, просопографічний, герменевтичний та ін. **Наукова новизна.** З'ясовано динаміку вирішення російською владою верхівкою на чолі з імператорами Павлом I, Олександром I та Миколою I «польського питання» в контексті виявлення специфічних інституційних форм і засобів інтеграції Правобережжя до Російської імперії. **Висновки.** Установлено, що конфігурації відносин імперського центру з польськими елітами на Правобережжі у вказаних хронологічних межах визрівали від толерантного ставлення щодо польського впливу на суспільно-політичний розвиток регіону до послідовної політики уніфікації та деполонізації нових територій. За правління Павла I на приєднаних після поділів Речі Посполитої землях було відновлено генеральний суд, земські повітові та підкоморські суди, замість предводителів дворянства запроваджувалися посади губернських і повітових маршалів, хорунжих. Підтверджено, що у цей час на Правобережжі співіснували загальноросійські норми права і приписи Литовського статуту. За Олександра I було продовжено толерантне ставлення до польського впливу на правобережних теренах, що передбачало поєднання імперської політики уніфікації з визнанням регіональних особливостей та історичної своєрідності приєднаних територій. Зауважено, що принципів зміни в «польському питанні» відбулися за правління Миколи I, після революційних подій у країнах Європи та насамперед Листопадового повстання 1830 р. Визначено, що відтоді політика російського уряду стосовно поляків у правобережних губерніях здійснювалася за декількома напрямками: залучення польської шляхти до російських еліт шляхом інкорпорації її до дворянського стану з наданням відповідних прав і привілеїв; здійснення репресій проти польських патріотів; переведення більшості дрібнопомісної шляхти до податних станів; проведення судової реформи, за якої ґродські суди ліквідувалися та запроваджувалося обов'язкове використання російської мови у судочинстві; обмеження умов існування римо-католицької церкви; деполонізація й російщення освітньо-культурного простору. Підтверджено, що зміна курсу стосовно польського населення на Правобережжі в 1830-х рр. цілком відповідала стратегічним завданням імперської політики централізації та уніфікації у сфері державного управління, у правовому, соціокультурному просторах, закладеним в ідеологемі «самодержавство, православ'я, народність».

Ключові слова: Російська імперія, Польща, Правобережна Україна, адміністративно-територіальний поділ, судова реформа, деполонізація, російщення.