UDC: 351.82

Chorna Kateyna Pavlovna,
PhD. of Law, Associated Professor, Professor of the Department of Business law, labour rights and civil-law disciplines, Interregional Academy of Personnel Management, Kyiv, Str. Frometivska, 2, tel.: (044) 258 21 24, e-mail: katerynachornackp@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-0318-5237

Чорна Катерина Павлівна,
кандидат юридичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри господарського, трудового права та цивільно-правових дисциплін, Міжрегіональна Академія управління персоналом, Київ, вул. Фрометівська, 2, тел.: (044) 258 21 24, e-mail: katerynachornackp@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-0318-5237

Черная Екатерина Павловна,
кандидат юридических наук, профессор кафедры хозяйственного, трудового права и гражданско-правовых дисциплин, Межрегиональная Академия управления персоналом, Киев, ул. Фрометовская, 2, тел.: (044)258-21-24, e-mail: katerynachornackp@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-0318-5237
DOI https://doi.org/10.32689/2617-2224-2019-16-1-225-236

STATE GOVERNANCE IN UKRAINE DURING THE TIMES OF SUBORDINATION TO RUSSIA: PECULIARITIES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND POLICE APPARATUS

Abstract. The article examines the characteristic features of governance in the Ukrainian lands after the abolition of the Hetman and its entry (as well as other ethnic territories — Sloboda Ukraine and the provinces of the Kingdom of Poland) into the Russian Empire. Attention is focused on the managerial functions of the police segment: the author proves his decisive role in management at all levels, while at the same time covering the activities of the executive bodies formed by the electoral authority.

The work traces the influence of the central apparatus on local self-government and the gradual transfer of powers of individual units of provincial offices to sectoral Moscow ministries (former orders), the expanded functions of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the main governmental body that controlled the border

territories; also characterized the contradictions between the central and local authorities, which consisted primarily in the forms and methods of implementation of state policy in imperial districts, where the risks of socio-economic upheavals existed along with the threats of national explosions.

Given this, a significant part of the material presented is devoted to the study of government oversight powers, as well as the methods of the political police — the gendarmerie, and its struggle with national movements. The main idea of the article is to prove the thesis about the inefficiency and vulnerability of local authorities, which use violent methods to implement the center's policy, without taking political, socio-economic, cultural, religious activities to gain the loyalty of the local population — after all, it's crisis management and become one of the main reasons for the collapse of the tsarist regime and the emergence of opportunities for the future development of their own national institutions.

Keywords: the emperor, His Majesty's Own Office, ministries, province, governor-general, governor, mayor, chief of police, business case, gendarmerie, reform, district court, zemstvos, city council.

ДЕРЖАВНЕ УПРАВЛІННЯ У ПІДРОСІЙСЬКІЙ УКРАЇНІ: ОСОБЛИВОСТІ ЦАРСЬКОГО АДМІНІСТРАТИВНО-ПОЛІЦЕЙСЬКОГО АПАРАТУ

Анотація. Досліджено характерні особливості урядування в етнічних українських землях після скасування Гетьманщини та входження її (а також Слобідської України та воєводств Царства Польського) до складу Російської імперії. Увага зосереджується на причинах та принципах створення генерал-губернаторств та діяльності управлінських механізмів, на функціях губернаторських канцелярій та ролі поліцейського сегмента цієї галузі: доводиться його участь в урядуванні на всіх рівнях, паралельно висвітлюється робота виконавчих органів, сформованих виборною владою.

Прослідковано вплив центрального апарату на місцеве самоврядування та поступове передання повноважень окремих підрозділів губернських канцелярій галузевим московським міністерствам (колишнім приказам), описано функції Міністерства внутрішніх справ — головного урядового органу, який контролював прикордонні території; також схарактеризовано суперечності між центральною та місцевою владою, які полягали, насамперед, у формах та методах втілення державної політики в імперських віддалених губерніях, де ризики соціально-економічних потрясінь існували нарівні із загрозами національних вибухів.

З огляду на це, значна частина викладеного матеріалу присвячена вивченню урядових наглядових повноважень, а також методам діяльності політичної поліції — жандармерії, та її боротьбі з національними рухами. Головна ідея полягає у доведенні тези про неефективність та вразливість місцевої влади, яка використовує насильницькі методи для втілення політики центру, не здійснюючи політичних, соціально-економічних, культурних,

релігійних заходів щодо здобуття лояльності місцевого населення, — адже саме кризові явища в урядуванні і стали однією із найголовніших причин краху царського режиму і виникнення можливостей для майбутньої розбудови власних національних інституцій.

Ключові слова: імператор, "Власна Його Величності Канцелярія", міністерства, губернія, генерал-губернатор, губернатор, градоначальник, поліцмейстер, справник, жандармерія, реформи, земський суд, земства, міська дума.

ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ В УКРАИНЕ ВО ВРЕМЕНА ПОДЧИНЕНИЯ РОСИИ: ОСОБЕННОСТИ АДМИНИСТРАТИВОНО-ПОЛИЦЕЙСКОГО АППАРАТА

Аннотация. Исследованы характерные особенности управления в украинских землях после отмены Гетманщины и вхождения ее (а также других этнических территорий — Слободской Украины и воеводств Царства Польского) в состав Российской империи. Внимание сосредоточено на управленческих функциях полицейского сегмента: доказывается его определяющая роль в управлении на всех уровнях, освещается и деятельность исполнительных органов, сформированных избирательной властью.

Прослежено влияние центрального аппарата на местное самоуправление и постепенную передачу полномочий отдельных подразделений губернских канцелярий отраслевым московским министерствам (бывшим приказам), расширенные функции Министерства внутренних дел — главного правительственного органа, который контролировал пограничные территории; также охарактеризованы противоречия между центральной и местной властью, которые заключались прежде всего в формах и методах реализации государственной политики в имперских отдаленных губерниях, где риски социально-экономических потрясений существовали наравне с угрозами национальных взрывов.

Учитывая это, значительная часть изложенного материала посвящена изучению правительственных надзорных полномочий, а также методам деятельности политической полиции — жандармерии, и ее борьбе с национальными движениями. Главной же идеей является доказательство тезиса о неэффективности и уязвимости местной власти, которая использует насильственные методы для реализации политики центра, не совершая политических, социально-экономических, культурных, религиозных мероприятий по получению лояльности местного населения — ведь именно кризисные явления в управлении и стали одной из главных причин краха царского режима и возникновения возможностей для будущего развития собственных национальных институтов.

Ключевые слова: император, "Собственная Его Величества Канцелярия", министерства, губерния, генерал-губернатор, губернатор, градоначальник, полицмейстер, деловод, жандармерия, реформы, земский суд, земства, городская дума.

Problem statement in the thesis form and its connection with important scientific or practical tasks. The progressive campaign of Russian autocracy into Ukrainian statehood began in the days of Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and continues to this day. There alternately existed various supervisory bodies: the institute of the royal resident at the Hetman's mace worked, the Russian Orthodox Church periodically restored its activity, the Moscow voivods had unlimited powers in separate lands, the government in the Left Bank was carried out by the Hetman Government, formed totalitarian apparatus of tsarism and Bolshevism, formed latent pro-Russian structures which influenced the government decisions in independent Ukraine.

In the Cossack period the Great Russian authorities were still forced to reckon with the national traditions of governance, since these acts served as a gain of popular adherence: for example, among the grassroots Cossacks, even the expression was "queen-mother", and the royal service was perceived as a demanded Cossack mission [1]. There are also many historical facts about faith in the "good" ruler widespread in the peasant and working environment. Undoubtedly, during the period of 1654-1917 the leaders of the empire periodically carried out liberal steps that testify to attempts by the center to win the loyalty of the annexed lands. However, the methods of their implementation by the government bodies that worked in the Russian lands led to the destruction of trust in the authorities and the constant awareness of their own abusive position — all these issues now require additional scientific consideration.

Analysis of research and publications. The main sources for the development of this topic are archival material [10], a collection of legislative [2,4] and statistical acts [3, 8], as well as scientific works of the direct participant in the then governing organization of the border lands of P. Stolypin [14] and its evaluation of the activities of the world political science. The author uses the works of the Russian historian A. Kornilov [9]; refers to the research by D. Yavornytsky [1]; uses the materials of the Encyclopedia of History of Ukraine [7, 11, 13]. One of the important sources is the historical analysis of the peculiarities of administration in the ethnic Ukrainian lands carried out by O. Yarmysh [6].

Formulation of the purpose of the article:

- to describe the territorial and administrative structure of the ethnic Ukrainian lands after the abolition of the Hetmanate and their subsequent subordination to Russia;
- to give a description of the mechanisms of administration of the provinces, counties and townships; to prove the decisive role of the police in the local government;
- to highlight the significance of the executive structures created by the elected authorities;
- to emphasize the crisis phenomena in the tsarist government as the main causes of the collapse of the autocracy.

An overview of the main research material justifying the results.

The traditional Cossack Freedom — numerous attempts to get rid of any external pressure (or to change the

Eastern vector to the West), repeated attempts to make the hetman's mace an hereditary relic and gain autonomy for the Ukrainian lands forced the tsarist government to resort to tough measures and cease in the second half of the 18th century the activity of the national government. Moreover, there were objective (for Russia) preconditions for this: after the victory in the Russian-Turkish wars, the threat from the Crimea disappeared, and, consequently, also the need for a terrible border force which was the Cossacks. Thus, after the liquidation of the Hetmanate and the Zaporozhian Sich a long period of Russian rule in the Ukrainian lands began.

At the end of the 18th and early 19th centuries almost 80 % of the Ukrainian ethnic lands were part of the Russian Empire: after the abolition of the Hetman's system more than 8 million people lived in 9 provinces (by the end of the 19th century this figure had risen to 24 million, more than 17 million were ethnic Ukrainians). Thus, in Podillya the Ukrainians accounted for up to 90 % of the local population; mostly non-Ukrainian was only the population of the large cities — Kyiv, Odessa, Kharkiv [2].

The administrative — territorial division here was quite peculiar, as historic land identification: Left Bank, Right Bank, Slobozhanshchyna, Southern Ukraine, as well as the Crimea (after the Russian-Turkish confrontation).

Officially there were three general-governorates: Malorossiysk (with Kharkiv, Chernihiv, Poltava provinces); Kyiv (with Kyiv, Volyn, Podil provinces); Katerynoslavska, Kherson and Tavria provinces were part of the Novorossiysk and Bessarabian general-governorate. This system has undergone numerous changes that depended on a number of circumstances: national movement, military campaigns, migration processes [3].

The official head of state was the Russian Emperor; the same functions of the former Malorossiysk were handed over to His Majesty's Office of the Chancellery and branch ministries, in particular the new Ministry of the Interior that had a major role in the approval of the governor general and governors and in defining ways to implement the imperial policies. The essence of this policy, as was the case in Siberia, Central Asia or the North Caucasus, was the scarcity of the local population and the use of resources, and the main method of its implementation was coercion.

General — Governorate — the institution of power that in tsarist Russia was introduced in conquering and organizing the subordination of passionate marginal lands whose population resisted (or posed a potential threat) to imperial power; accordingly, the governor general, the personal royal representative — a new post in the local administration, is typical only for the border areas annexed during the military companies or socio-economic colonization. He, as before, continued to be called the "governor of the land". The general governor-general, as a rule, was appointed from among military leaders who had experience in conducting military campaigns and suppressing national uprisings; he possessed an additional resource for this purpose and was a direct representative of the absolutist regime in the local

administrative apparatus, focusing in his own hands the full power (military, administrative and before reforms of 60's — even judicial) [4]. An important right to punish belonged to him regardless of the rank, title and position of persons who resisted the established procedures.

The governor headed the administration of the largest territorial unit. The province was divided into counties; those, in turn, consisted of townships. Provinces, counties and townships had their centers and local official bodies of executive power — however, in addition to the departments, in the post-reform period in many cities the elected city councils, magistrates and town councils intensified their activity; influential aristocratic assemblies led by the leaders who took the most active part in the formation of the local government were created; attempted to organize zemstvos (the activities of the latter have always met with silent opposition from the tsar's officials), among which there were exceptions. Thus, the head of the Russian government, P.A. Stolypin, during his tenure as Minister of the Interior, who was subordinated to "malorossiysk" officials, considered it necessary to liberalize the regime in the Russian lands and took a number of measures in this direction, from increasing the bureaucratic responsibility for the brutal attitude towards the population and up to the dissolution of the State Duma due to inaction during the popular upheavals of 1905.

The provincial government was governed by the office of the governor whose post appeared in Russia under Peter I, as well as the vice-governor, governor's advisers and prosecutor. The sectoral provincial administrative institutions acted separately, the provincial court chambers and extensive police services were formed — "presences" that performed, first of all, punitive functions; in provincial cities this service was headed by a police chief; in the counties — town governors; the bailiffs and warders acted in smaller territorial units, and they also performed most of the functions of the former judicial officials — the vozni. All these appointments were made by the governor alone; he also added to reports to the Ministry of the Interior reports of police and gendarmerie services regarding the loyalty of the population which separately indicates a certain direction of his administration activity.

In the counties where there were aristocratic assemblies and zemstvo institutions, and that had their own treasury, customs structures and management of the state property, the main body of the local government (both in pre-reform and in the post-reform period) was a zemstvo court. Its powers were extraordinary: the head of justice (the head) appointed the Ministry of the Interior, and, in addition to justice, his subordinate structure exercised real control on the ground — controlled the rule of law, oversaw the taxes, state property, customs, formed police structures, embodied the decrees of the governors-general, ruled the nobility [6].

Consequently, after the introduction of the institute of the governor general, as well as after the creation of branch ministries, which gradually began to form their own local structures

themselves, the economic functions of the governor-governor began to level out. But this post has not lost its main (supervisory) status: exercising control over the activities of the government provincial structures, extending its authority to judicial institutions and approving court rulings, he, in essence, turned into an official of the Ministry of Internal Affairs that was responsible for the implementation of the laws of the Russian Empire, for the implementation of the decrees of the Government Senate on subordinate lands [6].

In the counties where there were aristocratic assemblies and zemstvo institutions, and that had their own treasury, customs structures and management of the state property, the main body of the local government (both in pre-reform and in the post-reform period) was a zemstvo court. Its powers were extraordinary: the head of justice (the head) appointed the Ministry of the Interior, and, in addition to justice, his subordinate structure exercised real control on the ground — controlled the rule of law, oversaw the taxes, state property, customs, formed police structures, embodied the decrees of the governors-general, ruled the nobility.

However, the main feature of the organization of the local government in the Russian lands during the autocracy was the granting of extraordinary administrative powers to individual officials responsible for the internal affairs: in comparison with the governor's duties, duties, for example, of the mayors (heads of border cities) were even wider — since they were introduced into the most explosive in terms of national and social conflicts in the areas.

Thus, city mayors of the cities of Odessa, Sevastopol, Kerch, and Mykolayiv were full masters of the cities, focusing in their hands the legislative executive and judicial (civil and military power); subordination of the general — the governor of the province was extremely nominal, because the mayors were appointed by the Emperor and reported to him through the Ministry of the Interior. According to sources, self-government in these cities existed only de jure (at least — to the reforms of 60–80's of the 19th century and the establishment of non-stop city dumas and their executive bodies — city administrations that had some powers in the socio-economic sphere), since all the decisions of the city local authorities were approved by the mayors [8].

The administrative and police administration apparatus has undergone significant changes after the royal decree of 1862 and should be exempted from impractical police powers in the field of politics and socio-economic sphere and focus on law enforcement, "decency" of the population and search activities.

Homeland Police was abolished after the abolition of serfdom. However, the provincial police officers, district police officers, as well as city officials — district police officers and their assistants, province police officers, county police officers and township policemen continued to carry out general surveillance in all the spheres of the public life, and after the massive peasant and workers' worries the number of police units increased significantly (in including, and at the expense of police units, — are hardly the first in Europe formed at private expense).

The tsarist regime continued to confirm the role of the gendarme in Europe and in all the colonized lands and in the force of the conquered territories: the role of the political police in the government was steadily increasing, the search and punishment of the "anti-government segment" gained enormous volumes, especially "on the territory of Malorossiya and Poland, where even attempts to defend Uniate or Catholic faith, Malorossian or Polish language "[9]. Precisely because of this "representatives of indigenous ethnic groups, Catholics and Jews were not allowed to serve in the gendarmerie corps; almost a hundred percent the gendarmes had aristocratic descent, high level of education, the highest sector pay". In Ukraine, there were 9 gendarmerie corps (in 9 provinces), separate corps — in Odessa and Sevastopol (after the revolutionary riots of 1914), whose states were constantly replenished by more experienced specialists from the metropolis.

In addition to political oversight of the various layers of the population, the search for enemies of the government and their elimination was an important feature of gendarmerie activity, as well as in all the punitive organizations in Ukraine was the struggle against nationalism. In the secret circular of the Ministry of Internal Affairs "On Aliens and Separatism" it was noted that "it is necessary to observe the spirit of the entire population and to rid the political ideas of society, trying to investigate the causes of unfavourable government mood of the minds" [10]. With instructions from the imperial government not to openly interfere with the issue of the national culture and to enable Ukrainians and Poles to implement language policy, the gendarme services possessed a remarkable ability to retrain cultural and linguistic matters into political crimes.

This specificity of the activity gave rise to a contemptuous attitude to the gendarmes not only among the local population, but also among the Russian military and intelligentsia, and even among educated police officers: espionage, secret surveillance, provocations, numerous fabricated peasant and labour affairs, psychological methods of inquiry and recruitment, denunciations and bureaucracy, mutual oversight of one another, the struggle against confessions, a special "non-heroic" role in World War I was secretly and clearly condemned by the then elite as an unworthy activity for the "servants of the nobility" [11].

Thus, the final liquidation of the Cossacks and Magdeburg (and, at the same time, feudal governorship) in the Ukrainian lands took place. "His Majesty's the Office" has formed its own system of governance. Cossack military formations dissolved among state-owned peasants or turned into dragoons and hussars. The Ukrainian gentry, the Cossack elder of the Hetmanate received titles of nobility ("Letter of Attorney to the Nobility") and got the opportunity to hold high bureaucratic positions ("The Table of Ranks"). Both of these royal decrees now regulate the place of states in the state hierarchy; a similar step was taken for the Slobidska Ukraine with the decree "On the Malorossian ranks giving the right to a real or hereditary nobility" [12].

The support of the tsarist government of the upper strata of the popula-

tion was also carried out in the socio-economic sphere, which was largely after the introduction of the major and the enslavement of the peasantry, all of which, in aggregate, enabled the aristocratic domination to be preserved and in the political organization and formation of the local authorities — the zemstvos. The other free states — the petit bourgeoisie, the clergy of various denominations, the merchants, the bourgeoisie (the new Ukrainian state, which grew late, in comparison with the rest of Europe) — were discarded from broad participation in the government — until the zemsky reforms of 1864 prior to the introduction of the elective curial system, according to which not only the representatives of the nobility, the great landowners, the bourgeoisie, the intellectuals were allowed to participate in the zemstvos — even the prosperous peasantry, the burghers, merchants and artisans, who were now able to be the leaders of these zemstvos received the right of the assessors [13]. Partial influence on the activity of zemstvos were aristocratic collections — another elected body the leader of which was approved by the governor, but his leadership in the local administration was limited to holing at zemsky meetings; the nobles met once every three years — to solve local problems, which, as a rule, were not related to the state government.

Zemstvos played a huge role in the development of the local economy: they created educational and medical institutions, controlled trade and prices, roads were being built, funds were allocated for the local industry, postal transportation was organized, state owned buildings were being maintained, a number of social problems were controlled: illness, postures, drought, hunger, corruption, illegal embezzlement, soldier's service, etc. Particular importance was acquired by the zemstvo during the implementation of the program of reforms P. A. Stolypin [14]. However, at the beginning of the 19th century, a legitimate, power-dominated people, which for the local people became a personification of a genuinely popular power (since they were elected by general steps and kept at the expense of the community) was subjected to strict tsarist control: the central government formed a presence from the zemstvo affairs, which, in a few years limited the functions provided by the reforms of the zemstvo.

In the case of the Right Bank, the zemstvos as local government were formed only in the beginning of the next, 20th century — this process in the 19th century was slowed down in connection with the Polish national movement that was intended to restore the reign of the Kingdom of Poland to the Ukrainian right-bank lands. However, the Polish "separatists" did not receive the support of the local population, and they got the political fate of the Cossacks: the elimination of statehood, the destruction of the army, anti-Catholic campaigns, the punishment of the rebels, — already in the second half of the same century, began to work on the Russian administration model, which introduced the post which canceled the remnants of the last Lithuanian charter, introducing a government similar to the rest of the imperial territories.

Conclusions. The administrative — police system of administration of the Russian lands was formed on the basis

of traditional colonial models of the modern history: in the annexed territories dominated, in addition to economic, political and national oppression and spiritual oppression, since the indigenous ethnic groups are the bearers of the national idea and national struggle (and, therefore, the dangers for the regime). In fact, this system was aimed at preserving the foundations of autocracy, stopping revolutionary disturbances, and preventing the spread of national tendencies, because all this threatened the empire's integrity, as it was liberally-progressive on paper (in spite of the interchange of the zemsky, magdeburg and local-noble components) and punitive and repressive in fact. Bearing in mind the political and military threat of the Cossacks, the experience of numerous successful uprisings of Ukrainians against the treads, the tsarist government could not allow the "spring of peoples" to repeat in their own territories. However, these measures were taken not by means of reforms, agreements and concessions, but solely by the use of coercive apparatus, which mainly consisted of domination of the police component in the administration.

Supervision, repression, persecution and punishment were the main method of activity of all the government units: from the governor who took single-person decisions about mass shootings to the head of the township administration that could arbitrarily restrict the will of the peasant debtor for not fulfilling a large number of duties. In this regard, the personnel policy was based exclusively on principles such as political loyalty, devotion to the monarchical idea and thoughtless executive obedience, and the government was not about satisfying the improvement of the population, but the comprehensive oversight of the population.

True, in both parts of the Ukrainian lands, this system has undergone a certain liberalization after the reforms of the 60s of the 19th century, and especially at the beginning of the 20th century, when, as a result of the growth of revolutionary performances and national movement, tsarism began to suffer not only for the territorial integrity of the empire, but also for its own throne. However, these democratic steps did not stop the collapse of autocracy, programmed by the objective laws of the development of the society: state power built on violence inevitably undergoes a united resistance of all the layers — that's what happened in 1917.

REFERENCES

1. *Yavornitskiy, D. I.* (1989). Istoriya goroda Ekaterinoslava [History of the city of Yekaterinoslav]. Dnepropetrovsk: Promin [in Russian].
2. Akty, otnosyashchiesya k istorii Yuzhnoy i Zapadnoy Rossii [Acts relating to the history of southern and western Russia] (1886). Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiyskoy imperii — The complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire. (Vols. 9). Saint Petersburg. Retrieved from http://elib.shpl.ru/ru/nodes/178-polnoe-sobranie-zakonov-rossiyskoy-imperii-sobranie-pervoe-s-1649-po-12-12-1825-spb-1830 [in Russian].
3. Gubernii Rossiyskoy imperii: Istoriya i rukovoditeli. 1708–1917 [Gubernias of the Russian Empire: History and leaders. 1708–1917]. (2003). Moscow: Obedin. redaktsiya MVD Rossii.

Retrieved from http://www.prometeus.nsc.ru/contents/books/province.ssi [in Russian].
4. Gubernii Rossiyskoy imperii: Istoriya i rukovoditeli. 1708–1917 [Gubernias of the Russian Empire: History and leaders. 1708–1917]. (2003). Moscow: Obedin. redaktsiya MVD Rossii. Retrieved from http://www.prometeus.nsc.ru/contents/books/province.ssi [in Russian].
5. *Stolypin, P. A.* (1922). The Enciclopædia Britannica — 12. (Vol. XXXII Pacific Ocean Islands to Zuloaga). London, New York City [in English].
6. *Yarmysh, A. N.* (1992). Nablyudat neotstupno: adm.-polits. apparat i organy polit, syska tsarizma v Ukraine v kon. XIX — nach. XX v. [To observe relentlessly ... The administrative-police apparatus and the bodies of political investigation in Ukraine in the late XIX — early XX centuries]. Kyiv [in Russian].
7. *Holobutskyi, P. V.* (2005). Zemski sudy [Zemsky courts]. Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy — Encyclopedia of History of Ukraine. (Vols. 3). V. A. Smolii et al. (Eds.). Kyiv: Nauk. dumka [in Ukrainian].
8. Pravyashchaya Rossiya: Polnyy sbornik svedeniy o pravakh i obyazannostyakh administrativnykh uchrezhdeniy i dolzhnostnykh lits Rossiyskoy imperii [The ruling Russia: A complete collection of information on the rights and duties of administrative agencies and officials of the Russian Empire]. (1904). Saint Petersburg [in Russian].
9. *Kornilov, A. A.* (2018). Kurs istorii Rossii IX veka [The course of the history of Russia in the 9th century]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Yurayt [in Russian].
10. Tsentralnyi Derzhavnyi Istorychnyi Arkhiv Ukrainy [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine]. F. 442. Op. 626. Spr. 426. ark.1-17 [in Ukrainian].
11. *Boriak, H.,* et al. (Eds.). (2013). Ukrainska identychnist i movne pytannia v Rosiiskii imperii: sproba derzhavnoho rehuliuvannia (1847–1914): Zbirnyk dokumentiv i materialiv [Ukrainian identity and linguistic question in the Russian Empire: an attempt at state regulation (1847–1914): Collection of documents and materials]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy [in Ukrainian].
12. *Yarmysh, A. N.* (1992). Nablyudat neotstupno: adm.-polits. apparat i organy polit, syska tsarizma v Ukraine v kon. XIX — nach. XX v. [To observe relentlessly ... The administrative-police apparatus and the bodies of political investigation in Ukraine in the late XIX — early XX centuries]. Kyiv [in Russian].
13. *Chekhovych, V. A.* (2005). Zemska reforma 1864 [Zemsky reforms]. Entsyklopediia istorii Ukrainy — Encyclopedia of History of Ukraine. (Vols. 3). V. A. Smolii et al. (Eds.). Kyiv: Nauk. dumka [in Ukrainian].
14. P. A. Stolypin: programma reform. Dokumenty i materialy [P. A. Stolypin: a reform program. Documents and materials]. (2011). (Vols. 2). Moscow: Rosspen [in Russian].

СПИСОК ВИКОРИСТАНИХ ДЖЕРЕЛ

1. *Яворницкий Д. И.* История города Екатеринослава. —Днепропетровск: Проминь, 1989. — 197 с.
2. Акты, относящиеся к истории Южной и Западной России. [Електронный ресурс] /Полное собрание законов Российской империи. СПб.,1886. Т. 9. URL:http://elib.shpl.ru/ru/nodes /178-polnoe-sobranie-zakonov-rossiyskoy-imperii-sobranie-pervoe-s-1649-po-12-12-1825-spb-1830 (дата звернення: 31.10.2018).
3. Исторические данные об образовании губерний, областей, градона-

чальств и других частей внутреннего управления Империи [Електронный ресурс] / Губернии Российской империи: История и руководители. 1708–1917 (М.: Объединеи редакция МВД России, 2003. — 535с. URL: http://www.prometeus.nsc.ru/contents/books/province.ssi (дата звернення: 05.11.2018)
4. Там же. — С. 479.
5. Stolypin, Peter Arcadevich // The Enciclopædia Britannica—12—London, New York City: 1922. — Vol. XXXII Pacific Ocean Islands to Zuloaga. — P. 578.
6. *Ярмыш А. Н.* Наблюдать неотступно: адм.-полиц. аппарат и органы полит, сыска царизма в Украине в конце XIX — начале XX в. — К., 1992. С. 7–8.
7. *Голобуцький П. В.* Земські суди // Енциклопедія історії України: у 10 т. / редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін.; Інститут історії України НАН України. — К.: Наук. думка, 2005. Т. 3. С. 350.
8. Правящая Россия: Полный сборник сведений о правах и обязанностях административных учреждений и должностных лиц Российской империи. — СПб., 1904.
9. *Корнилов А. А.* Курс истории России IX века / А. А. Корнилов. — М. : Юрайт, 2018. — 404 с.
10. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 442. Оп. 626. Спр. 426, арк. 1–17.
11. Українська ідентичність і мовне питання в Російській імперії: спроба державного регулювання (1847–1914): Зб. документів і матеріалів / Відп. ред. Г. Боряк; Упоряд.: Г. Боряк, В. Баран, Л. Гісцова, О. Музичук, П. Найденко, В. Шандра; НАН України. Ін-т історії України; Укрдержархів, ЦДІАК України. — К.: Ін-т історії України, 2013. — 810 с.
12. Там само. — С. 7–8.
13. *Чехович В. А.* Земська реформа 1864 // Енциклопедія історії України: у 10 т. / редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін.; Ін-т історії України НАН України. — К. : Наук. думка, 2005. — Т. 3. С. 346.
14. П. А. Столыпин: программа реформ. Документы и материалы в 2 т. – Изд.: Росспэн, 2011. Т. 2. 799 с.