ІСТОРІЯ УКРАЇНИ

UDC 94 (477)«17-18»

SERGEY I. DEGTYAREV
Sumy State University, Dr (History), Assosiate Professor (Ukraine)

TOPICAL ISSUES OF THE HISTORY OF CIVIL OFFICIALDOM IN UKRAINE AT THE END OF THE EIGHTEENTH – THE FIRST HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURIES*

The author emphasizes the importance of the historical research of the civil officialdom in the Ukrainian lands during the period of the Russian Empire. The range of the most under-investigated aspects of this subject has been specified: social structure of Ukrainian officialdom; the process of Ukrainian service elite's joining into the bureaucracy of the Russian Empire in the end of the eighteenth century; education level of the state officials in the Ukrainian lands; types of violations and abuses and their reasons; officials' encouragement system. The conclusion is made that during the second half of the eighteenth century – first half of the nineteenth century Ukrainian civil servants managed to save a number of specific features of sociocultural nature which distinguished them against the general background of the Russian Empire bureaucracy.

Keywords: *Ukraine, Russian Empire, Table of Ranks, civil officials, bureaucracy, state service, social origin, education, violations and abuses.*

ДЕГТЯРЬОВ С.І.
Сумський державний університет, доктор історичних наук, доцент (Україна)

АКТУАЛЬНІ ПИТАННЯ ІСТОРІЇ ЦИВІЛЬНОГО ЧИНОВНИЦТВА В УКРАЇНІ У КІНЦІ XVIII – ПЕРШІЙ ПОЛОВИНІ XIX ст.*

Автор актуалізує проблему вивчення історії цивільного чиновництва на українських землях періоду Російської імперії. Окреслено спектр найбільш малодосліджених аспектів цієї тематики: соціальний склад українського чиновництва; процес входження української службової еліти до бюрократичної системи Російської імперії у кінці XVIII ст.; рівень освіти державних службовців на українських землях; види службових порушень і зловживань та їх причини; система заохочень чиновників. Зроблено висновки про те, що протягом другої половини XVIII – першої половини XIX ст. цивільні чиновники України змогли зберегти низку специфічних рис соціокультурного характеру, які виділяли їх на загальному фоні бюрократії Російської імперії.

Ключові слова: *Україна, Російська імперія, Табель про ранги, цивільні чиновники, бюрократія, державна служба, соціальне походження, освіта, порушення і зловживання.*

ДЕГТЯРЕВ С.И.
Сумский государственный университет,
доктор исторических наук, доцент (Украина)

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ ИСТОРИИ ГРАЖДАНСКОГО ЧИНОВНИЧЕСТВА В УКРАИНЕ В КОНЦЕ XVIII – ПЕРВОЙ ПОЛОВИНЕ XIX вв.*

Автор актуализирует проблему изучения истории гражданского чиновничества на украинских землях периода Российской империи. Обозначен спектр наиболее малоисследованных аспектов этой тематики: социальный состав украинского чиновничества; процесс вхождения украинской служебной элиты в бюрократическую

систему Российской империи в конце XVIII в.; уровень образования государственных служащих на украинских землях; виды служебных нарушений и злоупотреблений и их причины; система поощрения чиновников. Сделаны выводы о том, что в течение второй половины XVIII – первой половины XIX вв. гражданские чиновники Украины смогли сохранить ряд специфических черт социокультурного характера, которые выделяли их на общем фоне бюрократии Российской империи.

Ключевые слова: *Украина, Российская империя, Табель о рангах, гражданские чиновники, бюрократия, государственная служба, социальное происхождение, образование, нарушения и злоупотребления.*

Studying the history of Ukraine and its nation-building at the end of the eighteenth– the first half of the nineteenth centuries most of the researchers paid little attention either to local regional and national differences of sociocultural nature or to administrative sphere. Mainly, the scientists focused on factual data – events which took place within this period in the territory of Ukraine as a part of the Russian Empire. To some extent, such approaches interrupt the connections between the components of the continuous process of Ukrainian nation- and state-building. Processes which took place in the Ukrainian society in the end of the eighteenth– nineteenth centuries are difficult to connect to state-building process of the middle of the seventeenth– the second half of the eighteenth centuries and the events at the beginning of the twentieth century. Thus, their cause-and-effect relationship is broken.

In order to solve these problems social relations in the Ukrainian lands, specific characteristics of Ukrainian society or its separate spheres (mentality, sociocultural level, etc.) should be investigated profoundly. In current work the emphasis is placed on such social group as officialdom of Ukraine; its socio-cultural and socio-professional characteristics, the process of joining to the Russian Empire bureaucratic environment at the end of the eighteenth – beginning of the nineteenth century, conditions of service in state institutions of the Russian Empire were also analyzed by the author.

There are many researches on the history of the officialdom of the Russian Empire. However, the number of works devoted to the civil officialdom in Ukraine is scarce. In pre-Soviet, Soviet and foreign historiography this issue was not specially investigated or the scientists referred to it tangentially (Z. Kohut, D. Beauvois, etc.) [2; 11; 12; 14; 22]. Their groundworks had a positive influence on the development of modern Ukrainian historiography of national officialdom. During the last two decades a number of studies revealing different aspects of state service on the Ukrainian lands under the Russian Empire and describing Ukrainian officials' private life and conditions of their service came into being [3; 8; 19; 31; 32].

Source base of the outlined range of problems consists of published and archive documents. Among the published sources the most interesting ones are represented by the memorials of people who served in public institutions in the Ukrainian lands, government regulations, which specifically coordinated the relations in bureaucratic environment on the lands of Left-bank, Southern and Right-bank Ukraine, published service records. The most informative, though, are the archival records, which are stored in central and state archives of Ukraine and Russia. Mostly, they are represented by official documents of different state institutions and personal materials of officials.

Currently, among the most challenging and under-investigated problems connected to the history of the civil officialdom in Ukraine during the Russian Empire period the following issues could be distinguished:

- the problem of a person social origin in the state service system of the Russian Empire and the ways of its solution in the Ukrainian lands;
- incorporation of Ukrainian administrative layer into imperial bureaucratic system;
- education influence on officials' proficiency and carrier opportunities;
- specification of the most common violations and abuses among the officialdom, investigation of the reasons of these negative phenomena and the methods of their control;

- the system of rewards and encouragements applied to the officials of civil institutions including those in the Ukrainian lands.

Let's briefly focus on the listed above aspects of Ukrainian civil officialdom history during the second halve of the eighteenth– first half of the nineteenth centuries.

* * *

The question of a social origin of a person who was trying to climb the state service career ladder was always pressing for the government of the Russian Empire. State posts at all times were a prerogative of the privileged social strata. For a long time government system and social structure of the Ukrainian lands differed from Russian ones. This caused certain peculiarities of joining of socially diverse Ukrainian service segment to the bureaucracy of the Russian Empire. The politics conducted by the Russian government in the Ukrainian lands at the end of the eighteenth– the beginning of the nineteenth centuries concerning the solution of civil officials' social origin problem differed from the measures taken in this sphere in many other regions of the Empire, particularly in originally Russian Governorates (Guberniyas). Almost up to the last quarter of the eighteenth century the majority of the administrative machine in the Ukrainian lands consisted of the descendants of Cossacks (in regiments, sotnias), burgess (in city institutions) and clergy. From the end of the eighteenth century the bureaucracy of the Russian Empire began to expand rapidly and often there were not enough people with corresponding education and who wanted to do state service (especially characteristic of bottom institutions). This problem could partly be solved by attracting representatives of Ukrainian service stratum to civil state service since they had comparatively high education level; wanted to get to the state service themselves (even on low positions); had bigger share of nobles, than in Russia, which gave the possibility at least to try to give noble tone to bureaucracy (Russian Government until Alexander II reform wouldn't leave the attempts, though unsuccessful, to keep nobility monopoly).

The society structure on the Ukrainian lands differed from Russian. In Ukraine there were nobility, Cossack starshyna (foremen), representatives of higher clergy, who referred to elite and had more rights. Nevertheless, peasants, burgess, merchants, lower clergy, regular Cossacks according to the old Lithuanian, Polish and Cossack legislation obtained certain rights and privileges, including for the state service. They could change their social status and even join the ranks of elite. Liquidating the rests of Ukrainian autonomy, Russian government for a certain time saved some old rules of the Ukrainians. Limiting the rights of peasants, burgess, merchants and clergy for state service, the government didn't apply such restrictions to Cossacks – the stratum which could be quite easily joined. Taking advantage of this, some people from lower social groups could get into state service [7, p. 82].

The process of Ukrainian officials' integration (in left-bank Ukrainian region) into the Russian Empire bureaucracy was followed by the division of Ukrainian (Cossack) military-civil government model into separate military and civil branches; active engaging of certain Ukrainian social groups into imperial civil service. People expressed desire to hold the positions in Russian state institutions since state service allowed them to secure their privileged status or attain it through the service. The government widely used the practice of awarding the Ukrainians with Russian ranks according to The Table of Ranks, which created the feeling of belonging to Russian Imperial bureaucracy [13; 23-30]. But there were many people who gave preference to old Ukrainian ranks, considering that they supposed more privileges and liberties, than Russian ones (in the past it was exactly that way) [15, p. 313-326; 16, p. 299-305, 359-371, 399-400; 17, p. 299-306, 369-380, 410-418; 18, p. 310-317, 387-399, 429-445]. During the last quarter of the eighteenth century Russian government legislatively prohibited to use old Ukrainian ranks [21]. Final integration of Ukrainian service stratum with Imperial bureaucracy took place around the beginning of the nineteenth century.

* * *

It was impossible to provide sufficient quantity of educated officials only by Ukrainian constituent. The nature of the education provided in the Empire up to the end of the eighteenth century could not entirely satisfy the demands of the times. Sophistication of bureaucratic functions, differentiation of civil state officials according to the specifics of duties performed by them (proceedings, law enforcements functions, financial control, administrating, etc.) required the establishment of fundamentally new education system. Development of education reform and its implementation delayed for a long time, though. The descents of privileged social groups were preferably accepted to newly created general educational establishments of local level (narodni uchylyshcha), but the nobles often didn't want to study since they could get the positions and obtain the ranks without education. Besides, the government could not organize the sufficient quantity of educational institutions.

In this time religious and secular educational institutions which operated in the Left- and the Right-bank Ukrainian lands became for the Russian government an alternative source of state service specials provision. Quite many people studied there and most of them wanted to join the state service in future. Thus, they partly covered state requirements in educated officials. In this respect, Kyivan Theological Academy and Seminary, Kharkiv Seminary, Chernihiv collegium and other played important role. They were the main suppliers of, if not professional officials, than at least prepared for the state service better, than the graduates of other educational institutions or those with home education or without it [7, p. 114-118].

With the development of education system in the Empire at the first half of the nineteenth century the possibilities of the descendants of different social groups for getting education were universalized in the entire state. The education itself was called to work exceptionally in the interests of state, namely to protect the interests of the Caesarism. But the Ukrainian lands for a long time continued to maintain the status of the key supplier of educated human resources for the various positions in state institutions. Here was the biggest quantity of those who wanted to study (the same situation was also in the regions subordinated to Vilna education district). Secular educational institutions, particularly Kyiv and Kharkiv Universities, Krzemieniec Lyceum, Prince Bezborodko's Gymnasium of Higher Learning in Nizhyn, Richelieu lyceum in Odessa, became the most popular. Thus, Ukrainian educational institutions considerably favoured the promotion of general education level of state officials in the Russian Empire at the end of the eighteenth century – the first half of the nineteenth century. This influenced the increase of the overall proficiency of the officialdom. Moreover, in many educational institutions in the Ukrainian lands pedagogical specialists were prepared.

* * *

The officials of the public education branch were a separate component of bureaucracy in the Russian Empire. The specifics of their service differed significantly from standard bureaucratic functions assigned to state officials. In the same time they enjoyed all the privileges proper to the officialdom. Scholastic service differed from any other by the officials' education level. Even after the cancellation of the examinations for the rank, certain education qualification requirements continued to be applied at employment of public education department officials. This type of service wasn't popular among the nobility. That's why the majority of teachers in the most educational institutions on the Left-bank and the South Ukrainian lands of the Russian Empire at the end of the eighteenth– the beginning of the nineteenth century consisted of the representatives of clergy while the descendants of other social groups were far less numerous [6]. Eventually, the government attempted to limit the access to teaching positions for the unprivileged population strata. But the amount of the nobility representatives had been increasing very slowly in this sphere. The situation on the Right-bank Ukrainian lands joined to the Russian empire in the last years of the eighteenth century was contrary. Here the pedagogical officialdom almost completely consisted of the nobility representatives. But

since 1830s the Russian government adopted a series of measures resulting in diversification of local pedagogical officials' status. As consequence, a lot of noblemen officials lost their status and were included into less privileged social strata.

* * *

Violations and abuses during the performance of duties were common in the officialdom environment. Their range was extremely wide. They affected the interests of entire society. It favoured the emerging of a negative image of an official in the society. Failure of the imperial government to conduct effective struggle with these phenomena in bureaucratic environment during many decades only fixed such image. In the memorials of many contemporaries, works of Ukrainian and Russian writers of that time violations and abuses among state servants were extensively criticized and satirized [4, p. 64-65; 10, p. 68]. Such "*constantly negative*" image of a state official resulted in perception of the most widely spread violations, especially bribery, as normal.

The reasons of negative phenomena which took place in the bureaucracy of the Russian Empire, particularly, in the Ukrainian lands, can't be looked for only in personal qualities of the officials-violators. Thus, the causes of sociocultural, economic and historical nature influenced minor violations, major abuses or crimes in bureaucracy. These factors affected the behavior of Ukrainian officials, but they could be not a result of political, cultural, socioeconomic development of specifically Ukrainian society. For example the practice of "*kormlenie*" has Russian roots and to certain extend influenced the development of bribery in Ukraine [1; 7, p. 223-225; 20].

In the Ukrainian lands from the end of the eighteenth century the officials of state institutions for unsatisfactory performance of their duties were most often punished with penalties, dismissals, etc. At the first half of the nineteenth century rather light punishments were applied to guilty officials. Moreover, consideration of judgments extended for a long time or the violators could even be justified. To some extent it evidences the desire of the government whatever it takes (even ignoring negative phenomena which took place in bureaucratic environment) to defend the "*esprit de corps*" of the officials, who were actually the representatives and the holders of the power. The punishments preferably concerned the officials of lower level.

* * *

Different encouragements were also applied towards civil officials. They, as well as punishments, had the aim to strengthen the bureaucratic system of the Russian Empire, to make a liegeman of the monarchal will out of every official. The encouragements were widely used by the Imperial government in order to provide numerous state institutions by the necessary quantity of officials and in order to motivate the officialdom for better performance. In this regard, the most effective and time-proven incitements applied in the Ukrainian lands was awarding ranks and orders [9]. But awarding civil officials with orders took place infrequently and mostly referred to those who held higher posts. Moreover, many civil officials received orders not in civil, but proceeding military service.

Imperial promotion according to The Table of Ranks played an extremely important role in the Ukrainian lands. In the second half of the eighteenth century the rank was used as one of the mechanisms of Ukrainian service elite inclusion to the bureaucratic system of the Russian Empire. Owing to the rank an official received benefits, occupied a more privileged place in society, identified himself as a representative of the authority, which raised his prestige. After the loss of the autonomy of the Ukrainian lands the rank became both a mechanism and an incentive for Ukrainian officials which allowed them to adapt to new conditions of life in multi-ethic empire. There was a practice of awarding Ukrainian civil officials with Russian standard ranks even before the implementation of all-Imperial legislation in the Ukrainian lands. It could be estimated as a preparation for joining Russian and Ukrainian bureaucratic systems.

In general, owing to ranks and orders many Ukrainian officials could satisfy their social, material and career requirements in new sociopolitical realities, which had been developing on the Ukrainian lands from the end of the eighteenth– the beginning of nineteenth centuries [7, p. 258-276].

One of the most prestigious awards was the assignation of land allotments in the property of officials. Only public servants of the highest ranks who hold highstate posts could reckon on such encouragement. But the representatives of Ukrainian service elite who descended from Cossack starshyna could obtain from Russian government rank lands in Left-bank and Sloboda Ukraine for perpetual use in the second half of the eighteenth century. Before, the rank lands were only given to the Cossacks for the period of service. The assignment of these lands in perpetual use favoured the establishment of Ukrainian elite's loyalty to Russian government. Although such type of awards was used extremely rarely [5].

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the government complicated the chance to receive ranks and orders and entirely cancelled awarding with lands. Financial encouragements came into wider use. The officials were also rewarded with service medals, gifts, gratitudes, etc. This was connected to the expanding of bureaucracy and expensiveness of its maintaining. These changes were common to all the regions of the Russian Empire. During the first part of the nineteenth century awards and motivations used by the government towards civil officials were finally systematized – a certain list of encouragements as well as the conditions of officials' rewarding were defined.

* * *

Thus, the institution of state service established during the period of the Russian Empire firmly entered the life of Ukrainian society together with all its positive and negative attributes. It outlasted not only the Empire, but also the Soviet Union by adjusting successfully to command administrative economy. Nowadays, having experienced minor alternations, this institution continues its existence in many post-Soviet countries, including Ukraine. But in the end of the nineteenth century the Russian Imperial bureaucratic system completely changed national Ukrainian administrative practices. At first sight it resulted in quick and complete assimilation of Ukrainian service mass into Imperial bureaucratic environment, but civil officialdom in the Ukrainian lands, and mostly Ukrainian by origin, during the end of the eighteenth – the first half of the nineteenth centuries managed to save a range of specific features, which distinguished Ukrainian officials against general background of governmental administrative branch of the Russian Empire.

*The work carried out within the framework of fundamental research 0115U000667 "The historical development of borderlands Northeast Ukraine as a means of constructing a national historical memory model".

1. *Берлин П.* Русское взяточничество, как социально-историческое явление / П. Берлин // Современный мир. – Август. – 1910. – С.45-56.

2. *Бовуа Д.* Гордиев узел Российской империи: Власть, шляхта и народ на Правобережной Украине (1793-1914) / Даниель Бовуа / Авторизированный перевод с французского Марии Крисань. – М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2011. – 1008 с.

3. *Володько В.В.* Роль дворянського самоуправління в поповненні чиновницького апарату Київського намісництва в 80-х – першій половині 90-х рр. XVIII ст. / В.В. Володько // Часопис української історії: Збірник наукових статей. – К., 2006. – Вип. 4. – С. 7-12.

4. *Гольцев В.А.* Законодательство и нравы в России XVIII века / В.А. Гольцев. – Изд.2-е. – СПб.: Типография А. Якобсона Насл., 1896. – 164+XXXII с., с. 64-65.

5. Групові формулярні списки чиновництва Новоросійської губернії за 1798 рік / Упорядник Панкєєв О.С. – Запоріжжя, 2011. – 125 с.

6. *Дегтярьов С.І.* Місце духовних навчальних закладів у підготовці кадрів для цивільних державних установ Російської імперії у XVIII ст. / С.І. Дегтярьов // Науковий вісник Миколаївського національного університету імені В.О. Сухомлинського: Збірник наукових праць. – Випуск 3.31: Історичні науки. – Миколаїв: МНУ, 2011. – С. 55-63.

7. *Дегтярьов С.І.* Цивільне чиновництво України у кінці XVIII – першій половині XIX ст.: монографія / С.І. Дегтярьов. – Суми: ТОВ Друкарський дім «Папірус», 2014. – 472 с.

8. *Дегтярев С.И.* Унификация бюрократических систем Бессарабии и Малороссии в период их интеграции в состав Российской империи в конце XVIII – первой трети XIX вв. / С.И. Дегтярев // Русин. – №1(34). – 2014. – С. 91-104.

9. Державний архів Харківської області, ф. 267, оп. 1, спр. 43, 5 арк.

10. *Катаев И.М.* Дореформенная бюрократия по запискам, мемуарам и литературе / И.М. Катаев. – СПб.: Книгоиздательство типо-литографии «Энергия», б/г. – 180 с.

11. *Когут З.* Російський централізм і українська автономія. Ліквідація Гетьманщини, 1760-1830 / Зенон Когут. – К.: Основи, 1996. – 317 с.

12. *Когут З.* Українська еліта у XVIII столітті та її інтеграція в російське дворянство / З. Когут // Коріння ідентичності. Студії з ранньомодерної та модерної історії України. – К.: Критика, 2004. – С. 46-79.

13. *Кривошея В.В.* Козацька еліта Гетьманщини / В.В. Кривошея. – К.: ІПіЕНД імені І.Ф. Кураса НАН України, 2008. – 452 с.

14. *Лазаревский М.И.* Памяти мои / М.И. Лазаревский // М.І. Лазаревський, О.М. Лазаревський. Пам'яті мої. Prodomosua. Мемуарна хроніка (XVIII-XIX ст.). – Київ-Самара, 2004. – С.43-92.

15. Месяцеслов с росписью чиновных особ в государстве, на лето от Рождества Христова 1791. – СПб.: При Императорской Академии Наук, б/г. – XX+380+VIII с.

16. Месяцеслов с росписью чиновных особ в государстве, на лето от Рождества Христова 1794. – СПб.: При Императорской Академии Наук, б/г. – XX+400 с.

17. Месяцеслов с росписью чиновных особ в государстве, на лето от Рождества Христова 1795. – СПб.: При Императорской Академии Наук, б/г. – XX+423 + IX с.

18. Месяцеслов с росписью чиновных особ в государстве, на лето от Рождества Христова 1796. – СПб.: При Императорской Академии Наук, б/г. – XIV +464 с.

19. *Молчанов В.Б.* Життєвий рівень чиновників правоохоронних установ в Україні у XIX – на початку XX ст. / В.Б. Молчанов / Інститут історії України НАН України. – К., 2007. – 113 с.

20. *Морякова О.В.* Провинциальное чиновничество в России второй четверти XIX века: социальный портрет, быт и нравы / О.В. Морякова // Вестник Московского университета. – Серия 8. История. – 1993. – №6. – С.14-29.

21. О ненаграждении впредь служивых Малороссийских людей прежними Войсковыми чинами // ПСЗ-1. – Т.XXII. – №16117.

22. *Уортман Р.С.* Властители и судии: Развитие правового сознания в императорской России / Ричард С. Уортман. – М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2004. – 520 с.

23. Центральний державний історичний архів України (далі – ЦДІАУК), ф. 193, оп. 4, спр. 409, 5 арк.

24. ЦДІАУК, ф. 193, оп. 4, спр. 439, 10 арк.

25. ЦДІАУК, ф. 193, оп. 4, спр. 551, 11 арк.

26. ЦДІАУК, ф. 193, оп. 4, спр. 566, 4 арк.

27. ЦДІАУК, ф. 193, оп. 4, спр. 567, 5 арк.

28. ЦДІАУК, ф. 193, оп. 4, спр. 642, 4 арк.

29. ЦДІАУК, ф. 193, оп. 4, спр. 696, 7 арк.

30. ЦДІАУК, ф. 193, оп. 4, спр. 849, 4 арк.

31. *Шандра В.С.* Державна служба в українських губерніях Російської імперії / В.С. Шандра // Історія державної служби в Україні. У 5 т. / [О.Г. Аркуша, О.В. Бойко, Є.І. Бородін та ін.; відп. ред. Т.В. Мотренко, В.А. Смолій; редкол. С.В. Кульчицький (кер. авт. кол.) та ін.]; Голов. упр. держ. служби України, Ін-т історії НАН України. – К.: Ніка-Центр, 2009. – Т. 1. – С. 279-318.

32. *Degtyarev S.I.* The Problem of the Social Background of Government Officials within the Policies of the Romanovs (18th Century – First Half of the 19th Century) / S.I. Degtyarev // Bylye Gody. – 2013. – Vol. 30 (4). – C. 28-35.

References

1. Berlin P. Russkoe vziatochnichestvo, kak sotsial'no-istoricheskoe iavlenie / P. Berlin // Sovremennyi mir. – Avgust. – 1910. – S.45-56.

2. Bovua D. Gordiev uzel Rossiiskoi imperii: Vlast', shliakhta i narod na Pravoberezhnoi Ukraine (1793-1914) / Daniel' Bovua / Avtorizirovannyi perevod s frantsuzskogo Marii Krisan'. – M.: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2011. – 1008 s.

3. Volod'ko V.V. Rol' dvorians'kogo samoupravlinnia v popovnenni chinovnits'kogo aparatu Kiïvs'kogo namisnitstva v 80-kh – pershii polovini 90-kh rr. XVIII st. / V.V. Volod'ko // Chasopis ukraïns'koï istoriï: Zbirnik naukovikh statei. – K., 2006. – Vip. 4. – S. 7-12.

4. Gol'tsev V.A. Zakonodatel'stvo i nravy v Rossii XVIII veka / V.A. Gol'tsev. – Izd.2-e. – SPb.: Tipografiia A. Iakobsona Nasl., 1896. – 164+XXXII s., s. 64-65.

5. Grupovi formuliarni spiski chinovnitstva Novorosiis'koï gubernïï za 1798 rik / Uporiadnik Pankєєv O.S. – Zaporizhzhia, 2011. – 125 s.

6. Degtyarev S.I. Mistse dukhovnikh navchal'nikh zakladiv u pidgotovtsi kadriv dlia tsivil'nikh derzhavnikh ustanov Rosiis'koï imperiï u XVIII st. / S.I. Degtiar'ov // Naukovii visnik Mikolaïvs'kogo natsional'nogo universitetu imeni V.O. Sukhomlins'kogo: Zbirnik naukovikh prats'. – Vipusk 3.31: Istorichni nauki. – Mikolaïv: MNU, 2011. – S. 55-63.

7. Degtyarev S.I. Tsivil'ne chinovnitstvo Ukraïni u kintsi XVIII – pershii polovini XIX st.: monografiia / S.I. Degtiar'ov. – Sumi: TOV Drukars'kii dim «Papirus», 2014. – 472 s.

8. Degtyarev S.I. Unifikatsiia biurokraticheskikh sistem Bessarabii i Malorossii v period ikh integratsii v sostav Rossiiskoi imperii v kontse XVIII – pervoi treti XIX vv. / S.I. Degtiarev // Rusin. –№1(34). – 2014. – S. 91-104.

9. Derzhavnii arkhiv Kharkivs'koï oblasti, f. 267, op. 1, spr. 43, 5 ark.

10. Kataev I.M. Doreformennaia biurokratiia po zapiskam, memuaram i literature / I.M. Kataev. – SPb.: Knigoizdatel'stvo tipo-litografii «Energiia», b/g. – 180 s.

11. Kogut Z. Rosiis'kii tsentralizm i ukraïns'ka avtonomiia. Likvidatsiia Get'manshchini, 1760-1830 / Zenon Kogut. – K.: Osnovi, 1996. – 317 s.

12. Kogut Z. Ukraïns'ka elita u KhVIII stolitti ta ïï integratsiia v rosiis'ke dvorianstvo / Z. Kogut // Korinnia identichnosti. Studiï z rann'omodernoï ta modernoï istoriï Ukraïni. – K.: Kritika, 2004. – S. 46-79.

13. Krivosheia V.V. Kozats'ka elita Get'manshchini / V.V. Krivosheia. – K.: IPiEND imeni I.F. Kurasa NAN Ukraïni, 2008. – 452 s.

14. Lazarevskii M.I. Pamiati moi / M.I. Lazarevskii // M.I. Lazarevs'kii, O.M. Lazarevs'kii. Pam'iati moï. Prodomosua. Memuarna khronika (KhVIII-KhIKh st.). – Kiïv-Samara, 2004. – S.43-92.

15. Mesiatseslov s rospis'iu chinovnykh osob v gosudarstve, na leto ot Rozhdestva Khristova 1791. – SPb.: Pri Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, b/g. – XX+380+VIII s.

16. Mesiatseslov s rospis'iu chinovnykh osob v gosudarstve, na leto ot Rozhdestva Khristova 1794. – SPb.: Pri Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, b/g. – XX+400 s.

17. Mesiatseslov s rospis'iu chinovnykh osob v gosudarstve, na leto ot Rozhdestva Khristova 1795. – SPb.: Pri Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, b/g. – XX+423 + IKh s.

18. Mesiatseslov s rospis'iu chinovnykh osob v gosudarstve, na leto ot Rozhdestva Khristova 1796. – SPb.: Pri Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk, b/g. – XIV +464 s.

19. Molchanov V.B. Zhittєvii riven' chinovnikiv pravookhoronnikh ustanov v Ukraïni u XIX – na pochatku XX st. / V.B. Molchanov / Institut istoriï Ukraïni NAN Ukraïni. – K., 2007. – 113 s.

20. Moriakova O.V. Provintsial'noe chinovnichestvo v Rossii vtoroi chetverti XIX veka: sotsial'nyi portret, byt i nravy / O.V. Moriakova // Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. – Seriia 8. Istoriia. – 1993. – №6. – S.14-29.

21. O nenagrazhdenii vpred' sluzhivykh Malorossiiskikh liudei prezhnimi Voiskovymi chinami // PSZ-1. – T.XXII. – №16117.

22. Uortman R.S. Vlastiteli i sudii: Razvitie pravovogo soznaniia v imperatorskoi Rossii / Richard S. Uortman. – M.: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2004. – 520 s.

23. Tsentral'nii derzhavnii istorichnii arkhiv Ukraïni (dali – TsDIAUK), f. 193, op. 4, spr. 409, 5 ark.

24. TsDIAUK, f. 193, op. 4, spr. 439, 10 ark.

25. TsDIAUK, f. 193, op. 4, spr. 551, 11 ark.

26. TsDIAUK, f. 193, op. 4, spr. 566, 4 ark.

27. TsDIAUK, f. 193, op. 4, spr. 567, 5 ark.

28. TsDIAUK, f. 193, op. 4, spr. 642, 4 ark.

29. TsDIAUK, f. 193, op. 4, spr. 696, 7 ark.

30. TsDIAUK, f. 193, op. 4, spr. 849, 4 ark.

31. Shandra V.S. Derzhavna sluzhba v ukraïns'kikh guberniiakh Rosiis'koï imperiï / V.S. Shandra // Istoriia derzhavnoï sluzhbi v Ukraïni. U 5 t. / [O.G. Arkusha, O.V. Boiko, IE.I. Borodin ta in.; vidp. red. T.V. Motrenko, V.A. Smolii; redkol. S.V. Kul'chits'kii (ker. avt. kol.) ta in.]; Golov. upr. derzh. sluzhbi Ukraïni, In-t istoriï NAN Ukraïni. – K.: Nika-Tsentr, 2009. – T. 1. – S. 279-318.

32. Degtyarev S.I. The Problem of the Social Background of Government Officials within the Policies of the Romanovs (18th Century – First Half of the 19th Century) / S.I. Degtyarev // Bylye Gody. – 2013. – Vol. 30 (4). – S. 28-35.

Отримано 25.02.2015