
The aim of the work is to analyze the interaction of legislative prescriptions and everyday tradition in the matter of monetary payments for the rituals on the basis of contracts between the priest and parishioners in the Pyriatyn Protopopy. The results. The article examines the legal regulation of ceremony payment in the 18th century. Through the analysis of the cases of the ordination of a new priest to the parish, it was found out how the issue of monetary payments for services was settled at the parish level. The structure and contents of the agreements concluded between the parishioners and the priests of the Pyriatyn Protopopy were reviewed and analyzed. The influence of official norms on the everyday practice of payments for rituals has been studied. We traced factors that influenced the price policy in the payment of ceremonies. Conclusions. It has been established that at the legislative level, attempts to regulate the prices for ceremonies were made in the Appendix to the Spiritual Regulations and specified in the Synod decree of 1765. However, the legislative prescriptions did not cover all the claims submitted by the Church and therefore did not establish specific payment amounts. Individual provisions of the laws were vague and did not determine the exact fee, besides, there were no punishment mechanisms for violating the legal prescriptions. In the researched protopopy, payment norms were regulated by contracts between the priest and the parishioners. Contractual relations were formed even before the appearance of the decree of 1765 and continued to be concluded after that. The agreements contained a much wider list of requirements than the legislative acts. The prices indicated in the contracts did not always correspond to the legally established norms, however, the bishops ignored such facts based on the fact that the agreement signed by both parties is legitimate and will guarantee harmony in the parish. This allows us to assert that the tradition of the issue of payment for needs dominated over the legislative prescriptions.
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ЦІНА «ХЛІБІВ ДУХОВНИХ» У ПИРЯТИНСЬКІЙ ПРОТОПОПІЇ ДРУГОЇ ПОЛОВИНІ XVIII СТ.

Мета роботи – проаналізувати взаємодію законодавчих приписів і повсякденної традиції у питанні грошових оплат за відправлені треби на основі договорів між священником і парафіянами у Пирятинській протопопії. Результати. У статті досліджено законодавче регулювання оплати треб у XVIII столітті. Шляхом аналізу справ про рукопокладення нового священника на парафію з’ясовано, як улагоджувалося питання грошових оплат за відправлені треби на парафіяльному рівні. Розглянуто структуру та проаналізовано зміст угод, укладених між парафіянами і священниками Пирятинської протопопії. Вивчені вплив офіційних норм на повсякденну практику сплат за відправлені треби. Простежені чинники, які вплинули на цінову політику у разі оплати треб. Висновки. Встановлено, що на законодавчому рівні спроби врегулювати ціни за
відправлені treści були зроблені в Додатку до Духовного регламенту та конкретизовані в Синодському указі 1765 року. Проте законодавчі приписи не охоплювали всіх потреб, які подавала Церква, тож і не встановлювали конкретних сум оплати. Окремі положення законів були розмитими й не визначали точної плати, окрім того, не було встановлено механізмів покарання за порушення законодавчих приписів. У досліджуваній протопопії норми оплати потреб регулювались договорами між священником і парафіянами. Договірні стосунки склалися ще до появи указу 1765 року і продовжували укладатись після цього. В угодах містився набагато ширший перелік потреб, аніж у законодавчих актах. Ціни, зазначені в контрактах, не завжди відповідали законодавчо встановленим нормам, однак співпраці їх ігнорували такі факти, виходячи з того, що підписана обома сторонами уго да є легітимною й гарантує злагоду на парафії. Це дозволяє стверджувати, що традиція у питанні плати за потреби домінувала над законодавчими приписами.
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In the 18th century, the Orthodox Church experienced major changes associated with attempts to organize the Russian Empire based on the ideas of enlightened absolutism. Innovations affected many aspects of church life. However, their assessment is far from ambiguous. For a long time, the prevailing opinion in historical science was that the reforms were generally successful and led to a solid integration of church life in the Kyiv Metropolis. However, historians have recently questioned the effectiveness of the reforms and pointed to the preservation of many elements of the “Mohyla” church system.

We note that such a rethinking occurs as a result of a shift in the focus of scientific research, which is manifested in the growth of interest in “parochial civilization”. An important aspect of such studies is the clarification of issues related to the material support of parish priests.

This side of the life of the parish priests of the Kyiv Bishopric was studied by Petro Znamenskyi (Znamenskyi, 1873), Yefim Kryzhanivskyi (Kryzhanovskiy, 1890), Anna Morozova (Morozova, 2017), Maksym Yaremenko (Yaremenko, 2017) and other scientists. However, many issues related to the payment of tributes remain unresolved, and the financial support of the priests of the Pyriatyn Protopopia has not yet been considered at all.

Therefore, the purpose of the study is to analyze the interaction of legislative prescriptions and everyday tradition in the matter of monetary payments for ritual services on the basis of contracts between the priest and parishioners in the Pyriatyn Protopopy.

First of all, we should note that the protopopy is an ecclesiastical-administrative district into which the Kyiv Bishopric was divided in the 18th century. The sizes of the protopopy, as well as their number, were not constant. According to Oksana Prokopiiuk's calculations, in 1770, it included 65 churches, so it was one of the largest in the Kyiv Bishopric (Prokopiiuk, 2012, p. 152). According to the data on the number of churches and clergy in 1785, the protopopy had 66 churches (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 821. Ark. 17). Therefore, during the entire period under investigation, the Pyriatyn Protopopy was under the authority of the Kyiv Bishops and was one of the largest in the metropolis.

During the investigated period, the higher church leadership repeatedly tried to settle the issue of payment of debts. For the first time, this issue was written down in the Appendix to the Spiritual Regulations of 1722. In particular, in paragraph 21 of the section “About presbyters, deacons and other accomplices”, it was noted that the parish priest should be satisfied with voluntary donations for baptisms, weddings, burials, etc. The text clearly stated that the priests should not bargain with the parishioners for their needs and should not demand more than the amount given to them. First of all, the priests were warned about the inadmissibility of excessive charges for the sending of sorokousts (forty days’ prayers for the dead). The bishops, on the other hand, were obliged to control in every possible way the priests abusing their position (Addition to the Spiritual Regulations, 1830, p. 706).

The next point of the Appendix contained the intention to establish an annual fee from the parishioners for the maintenance of the priests. They, in turn, had to be limited to the set fee. The laity had the right to voluntary donations, but they did not have to coincide in time with the sending of prayers (Addition to Spiritual Regulations, 1830, p. 706). Thus, the above-mentioned document did not contain specific payment amounts. So, it was more of a declaration of intent. In the legislation of the 30s and 50s of the 18th century,
the provisions of the Spiritual Regulations regarding the payment of taxes were never specified.

He was approached on April 18, 1765, when the Synod decree “On determining the payment of priests and churchmen for spiritual needs” was promulgated. The document stated: “in the parishes, take: two kopecks for the prayer of a woman in labor, three for the baptism of an infant, ten for a wedding, ten for the burial of the elderly, and three kopecks for the burial of infants. Do not take anything for confession and communion of the Holy Mysteries, but for prayers and commemoration of parents, give to everyone out of grace and if possible” (About the determination of fees for sacred and church officials for spiritual needs, 1830, p. 117).

The decree stated that such prices are set for peasants and poor people. Wealthier parishioners had the right to donate more, however, they had to do it exclusively voluntarily. The decree categorically forbade priests and church workers to demand more than the sums established in it. The rates indicated above were in effect until 1801, when the Law “On the release of peasants from the obligation to cultivate church lands and on the doubling of the payment for the performance of worldly needs laid down in 1765” was promulgated. (On the liberation of peasants from the obligation to cultivate church lands and on the doubling of the payment established in 1765 for the fulfillment of worldly needs, 1830, p. 605–606).

We note that the decree contained only a partial list of duties practiced by the Church, so it did not establish payment norms for the rest of the duties. For example, he did not prescribe sums for remarriage, consecration of a house, baptism of an adult, etc. The legislative passage regarding the payment of memorial services “to give to everyone out of grace and if possible” also looks rather blurred. It is significant that not a single word is mentioned in the document about Sorokoust. Although this very need was cited in the Appendix to the Spiritual Regulations as a demonstrative example of the abuses of the priests. So, the decree of 1765 established an official tariff for services, however, it did not take into account all possible precedents for them and did not establish mechanisms for monitoring its implementation.

In the 801st fund of the State Archive of the Poltava Region, we found 38 cases about the ordination of a new clergyman to the parish in the Pyriatyn Archdiocese during the researched period. Four of them are dated 1758–1765, that is, they preceded the appearance of the above-mentioned decree. The rest appeared later.

The construction of all contracts is identical. Agreements include a preamble, main (estimate) and final parts. In the preamble, the parishioners ask the Bishop to appoint a specific person as a priest in their parish. The appeal was made from all the parishioners and in the case of the village belonging to a certain owner, for example, Maria Myloradovych was the owner of Piznyaky village, her personal request was added (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 41. Ark. 10). The main part included a list of requirements and the amount of payment for them. The final one included an assurance of the non-violation of the terms of the contract, which was sealed with the signatures of the priest and representatives of the community, as a rule, the Cossack elite of the village. Priest signed with his own hand, but the signature was often signed for the community by the actual conclusion of the agreement. For example, the above-mentioned contract between the laymen of the village of Piznyaky and the priest Havryil Borokhovych was drawn up and signed by the Chornukhy Cossack Omelyan Skovoroda (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 41. Ark. 11).

In the case of placing two priests in one parish, the agreement was signed with each one separately. For example, in 1773, Roman Stefanov was ordained half-priest of the Dormition Church in the village of Vechirky (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 348. 9 ark.). In the same year, his brother Hryhoriy became a priest (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 350. 16 ark.). Fee agreements were concluded with each of them personally, although their content is identical.

Out of 34 cases dated 1765–1783, payment contracts were found in 28. This is 82% of all cases. Therefore, we believe that the contractual regulation of the payment of fees in the protopopy operated both before and after the appearance of the synod decree of 1765, although this form of relationship between the priest and the parishioners was not foreseen in it.

A review of the rates confirms that the fee for the burial of an adult and a child in all transactions was 10 and 5 kopecks. An adult’s confession cost a kopeck, and a child’s – a “denezkka” (Russian copper coin in half a kopeck). For the baptism
of a baby, they took 2 kopecks. However, the Chornukhy priest Ivan Chempylovych stood out here, for whom this sacrament cost 4 kopecks (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 642. Ark. 6).

The first marriage in 24 contracts was set at the level of 10 kopecks. The most expensive one was owned by Semen Boichevskyi, priest of the Holy Trinity Church in the city of Pyriatyn. There, 30 kopecks had to be paid for it (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr 497. Ark. 4). The cost of second and third marriages ranged from 20 to 60 kopecks. In sixteen contracts, remarriage is valued at 20 kopecks. This is 57% of the total number, which indicates the dominance of just such an assessment of this sacrament. The price of 60 kopecks is found only once in the aforementioned agreement of Semen Boichevskyi. So, we can consider it an exception to the norm (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 497. Ark. 4). The lion’s share of contracts (20 out of 28) provided for the prospect of marrying people from outside their parish. This clause did not contain specific amounts, but stated that the issue would be resolved by agreement of the parties.

All treaties contain a reference to the sorokoust. It, as before, remained the most expensive thing in protopopy. The price for it ranged from 2 to 4 rubles. Only in the contract between the priest Roman Stefanov and the parishioners of the village of Bubny, the fee for this service is set at the level of 1 ruble 50 kopecks (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 495. Ark. 8).

In all agreements, a memorial service and an entry in the memorial or, as an option, a Sabbath book are recorded. The price for the memorial service was 10 kopecks. In 27 contracts, the price of a Saturday is set at 50 kopecks. An exception is the contract of the above-mentioned Chornukhy priest Ivan Chempylovsky, in which 1 ruble was to be paid for this service (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 642. Ark. 6).

Contracts contain prices for the consecration of houses, wells and pastures. The consecration of a house ranges from 10 to 30 kopecks, a well – from 5 to 10 kopecks, an Easter bread – from one kopeck or a “denezhka”. However, they are not recorded in all agreements. For example, house consecration is prescribed in 24 (86%), wells in 5 (18%), Easter bread in 14 (50%) out of 28 contracts.

It should be noted that two new requirements, which were not recorded in the previous agreements, appear in the contracts concluded after the decree was issued. The first of them is a prayer for a woman in labor. It is fixed in 7 cases and costs 1 kopeck. The second requirement was anointing with oil. This is the sacrament of healing the soul and body of a sick person, which takes place through a divine service, during which parts of the human body are anointed with holy oil (Puryaeva, 2001, p. 127). We find a mention of him in only two treaties. Its price was 20 kopecks.

The comparison of prices recorded in agreements with official prices allows us to talk about the differences between legislative norms and everyday practices. Only in the price for the burial of an adult and the wedding of newlyweds do we observe the concordance of the law and reality. Burial of a child cost more than the officially established norm, but baptism, on the contrary, was cheaper. Please note that by setting the price for confession and anointing, the local priests directly violated the letter of the law, because no payment was provided for these sacraments. We think that the fixation of specific prices for other needs also contradicted the decree, which noted the voluntary nature of payments for them.

So, the appearance of the decree in 1765 had little effect on the practice of payment of tributes in the Pyriatyn Protopopy. A certain exception can be considered only the appearance in agreements of prayers for women in labor. The coincidence of prices for burials and weddings, most likely, was not the result of legislative influence, but the result of compliance with the previous price policy. This opinion is supported by the awareness of the higher hierarchs with the fact of the discrepancy between the prices specified in the agreements and those established by law. We will remind you that agreements between laymen and priests were added to cases of ordination, so the church leadership could not be unaware of the situation. However, not a single case was found when such incompatibility prevented the ordination of the future pastor.

We assume that the reasons for this behavior of the bishops should be sought in material interest, because the newly appointed priest had to pay the money for receiving the canonical certificate. In addition, the prices fixed in the agreement were perceived as the result of “our general agreement” (DAPO. F. 801. Op. 1. Spr. 680. Ark. 2). Therefore, in the eyes of the bishop, they looked legitimate and were supposed to guarantee harmony in the parish in the future.
Summarizing the above, we come to the following conclusions: first of all, attempts to regulate the prices for services at the legislative level were made as early as in the Appendix to the Spiritual Regulations and specified in the Synod decree of 1765. However, the legislative norms covered an incomplete list of requirements, and individual provisions of the laws were not specific, besides, there were no punishment mechanisms for the priest for violating the legal prescriptions; secondly, in the investigated protopopy, payment norms were regulated by contracts between the priest and the parishioners. Contractual relations were formed even before the appearance of the decree of 1765 and continued to be concluded after its appearance. Thirdly, the prices specified in the contracts did not always correspond to the legally established norms, however, there is consistency in the price policy of the pastors. This allows us to assert that tradition dominated over legislative prescriptions in this matter.

Bibliography:

References:


