

Pleasures of the Learned in Eighteenth-Century Ukraine: The Culture of Tea, Coffee, and Wine Consumption of the Church Elite

Maksym Iaremenko

National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

Translated from Ukrainian by Marta D. Olynyk

Abstract: The history of stimulants and pleasurable ceremonies in Ukraine of early modern times has hardly been investigated. This article provides an overview of tea, coffee, and wine culture among representatives of the eighteenth-century church elite in the Kyiv Metropoly (subsumed as a synodal entity by the Russian Orthodox Church since 1686). The favour accorded these beverages is indicated in inventories of goods belonging to members of this social micro-group that list virtually an entire spectrum of accoutrements, locally made as well as imported (including table services from China and Germany). Although wine and coffee were already consumed in Ukrainian territories, the clergy's passion for various kinds of tea was sparked only around 1730, when it took consumers by storm throughout the Russian Empire. As medicinal ingredients, all three beverages were also mentioned in medical guides that were used in the Hetmanate at that time. Given that their cost, especially that of tea, was beyond what most could afford, drinking tea, coffee, and expensive wine became a mark of high status.

Representatives of the church elite in Russian-ruled Ukraine were able to participate indirectly in the contemporary tea, coffee, and wine culture thanks to their education. In the eighteenth century, being educated assured clerics of a successful career. By the same token, rising to the higher ecclesiastical ranks prompted changes in their day-to-day habits and provided them material possibilities to conform to high-status consumption behaviours.¹

Keywords: 18th-century Hetmanate; Kyiv Metropoly; tea, coffee, and wine culture.

¹ Originally published in Ukrainian as Maksym Iaremenko, "Nasolody osvichenykh v Ukraini XVIII stolittia (pro kul'turu vzhyvannia tserkovnoiu elitoiu chaitu, kavy ta vyna)," *Kyivs'ka Akademiia*, vol. 10, 2012, pp. 117-84. http://history.ukma.edu.ua/texts/yaremenko_pleasures/. Accessed 10 Jan. 2017. This article won the 2014 Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies (CIUS) article prize. Its present translation was sponsored by the CIUS Program on Religion and Culture and the Stephania Yurkiwsky Memorial Endowment Fund.

Whenever Ukrainian historians discuss the positive results of education, they usually indicate how intellectual baggage helps the bearer to carve out a career, serve the native land, spread enlightenment, and the like. Furthermore, knowledge acquired in the Early Modern period had a direct or indirect impact on other, “more prosaic,” things, for example, one’s external appearance or changes in everyday habits. In this article I will attempt to illustrate this statement with the example of the introduction of certain types of refreshments—tea, coffee, and wine—into the milieu of the church elite² of the Kyiv metropolitanate. First, I will focus in detail on the presence of these beverages in the “gastronomical culture” of the “high-ranking” (chynovne) clergy during this period.

“AFTER BREWING TEA, EAT FOR HEALTH”

The established culture of consuming tea by the church elite of the Kyivan metropolitanate in the eighteenth century is indicated by inventories of property owned by its representatives. Among private kitchenware we encounter practically a full range of service sets for preparing and consuming that particular beverage; in certain cases, complete sets, in others—partial ones. Lists of items feature large, metal kettles “for boiling water” (or “which heat water”), as well as smaller teapots for brewing (“a small teapot for drinking tea”); sometimes the latter were also made of metal, occasionally porcelain (see Addendum 1). Once the tea had steeped, it was drunk from special cups with a different volume capacity, and saucers were used. Some clergymen used a special, small sieve for straining the beverage (“a small straining spoon,” “a small sieve,” “a small strainer”). These utensils were made of diverse materials. Some inventories lead one to infer that the church elite was also familiar with the same whimsical features that amuse people today; for example, cups with tiny figures inside. Some inventories of property record porcelain cups with lids (*s kryshkamy*); a cautious conjecture might be that they were designed for brewing and consuming tea without the use of a teapot.

Inventories of private property and documents (correspondence to and from the Zaporozhian Sich) that I cite later reveal that tea was drunk with sugar; thus, sugar bowls, sometimes fashioned “in harmony with”

² In the category of the church elite or higher clergy of the Kyivan metropolitanate I include, first and foremost, in addition to the bishop, the following groups of monks: professors of the Kyivan Mohyla Academy, abbots, and high-ranking monastery brethren (usually those who were members of the spiritual councils of monasteries: vicars, stewards, and ecclesiarchs [sacristans]), as well as hegumens and archimandrites, who lived there “in tranquility,” i.e., in retirement.

(using corresponding materials) other tea accessories, were also used by monks. As far as one can judge from their laconic descriptions, some sugar bowls were quite refined; for example, some were footed or featured several small drawers to hold sugar as well as coffee or tea. Sugar bowls might have their own special spoons or tongs.

In addition to the utensils that were indispensable to brewing and consuming tea, the high-ranking clergy's "tea ceremony" also included other components. Some inventories of property list a container for storing the dry product: a tea caddy. Here and there they are called simply "tin vessels." Sometimes one can only guess at the contents of such tin containers, which may have been ubiquitous items and therefore called "spice jars" (*korinnytsi*) with good reason. For example, the abbot of the Vydubychi Monastery, Syf Hamaliia, owned "three Chinese copper and enamel cans" (1767). However, their function is not explained in the inventory; meanwhile, a "tea caddy" is mentioned separately.³ By the same token, one can only guess where Meletii, a hieromonk of the Vydubychi Monastery, who owned "four tin spice jars," and his fellow resident, Archimandrite Ilarion (see Addenda 1 and 2), stored their tea, and whether they used their tin containers for this product. Iakiv Markovych, general treasurer of the Cossack Hetmanate, for example, noted one time that, after obtaining some tea, "he poured it into a large tin container and a small one" (1729), without calling this receptacle a "caddy" (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha* 2: 280). Some references indicate the storage of other items, like "flints" in a tin "can" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 395, ark. 3).

It is difficult to establish the existence of special salvers for serving tea; they are not recorded in the inventories of items owned by the high-ranking clergy which I consulted, although such "trays" are encountered in other documents. For example, in 1724 Markovych ordered a "salver for tea or coffee" to be made for him out of tin (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha* 1: 141). Meanwhile, variously-sized "trays," mostly copper, enamel, and tin ones, but also those made of silver or a combination of materials (for example, "a small copper tray with blue enamel and inlaid with silver flowers," or "two black lacquered paper [trays] with gold," or "four small paper trays woven on the inside") were a usual staple of daily life both among clergymen, whose inventories do not

³ Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in the City of Kyiv (hereafter cited in-text as TsDIAK Ukrainy), f. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a., ark. 14-14v. Hrinchenko's dictionary defines the word *pushka* as a "tin or wood box" (3: 503). In *Slovar' Akademii Rossiiskoi* (St. Petersburg, 1794), pt. 6 and the last one (from T to the end), col. 659, the word *chaynytsia* is defined as a "container for storing dry tea, brought out when tea is served."

mention any tea and coffee services, and those who consumed coffee.⁴ Some inventories mention special tablecloths for tea-time among a variety of “tablecloths,” “napkins, serviettes, [and] table fittings.”⁵ For example, the list of items (1767) belonging to Syf Hamaliia, the deceased hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery, mentions “a red woolen cloth for the table for tea-time” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a, ark. 13) and in 1769 Saint Nicholas’s Monastery acquired two “serviettes for tea-time,” along with other tablecloths and napkins (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262. ark. 20).

Besides the above-mentioned domestic appurtenances of the “tea ceremony,” there were other, rather specific, components. For example, in 1759 “three glazed pots for tea water [and] a small pot for fifteen kopecks each” were purchased for the metropolitan of Kyiv.⁶ It is difficult to say where high-ranking clergymen obtained water for their beverages, but Maksym Berlyn's'kyi in his *Istoriia goroda Kieva ot osnovaniia ego do nastoiashchego vremeni* (The History of the City of Kyiv from Its Founding to the Present Day), which was written at the turn of the eighteenth century, noted:

Dnieper water is yellow in colour and differs markedly from the clear water of the Desna, which is somewhat ferrous in quality, soft and sweet for drinking; it is also entirely suitable for brewing tea and washing; it is thus superior to many spring waters near Kyiv, some of which, however, being completely pure, are preferred for drinking; others, mostly teeming with nitrate, gypseous, saline, or ochre substances, are both noxious and used in case of need. (222)

For boiling water, a crucial step in the preparation of a hot beverage, special “tea braziers” (*faierky chaievi*) were used occasionally. It is this very designation of this small, portable heater, which is indicated in the 1774 inventory of property owned by the hieromonk Iosyf (see Addendum 2).

⁴ See, for instance, the 1767 inventory of utensils owned by Syf Hamaliia, hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery, and Mykolai Tsvit, archimandrite of St. Cyril’s Monastery (1784): TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 178, spr. 43, ark. 17v; f. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a, ark. 14-14v.

⁵ For Rafail (Zaborovs'kyi), cathedral monastery funds were used to purchase even “starch for the bishop’s napkins and tablecloths” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 129, op. 2, spr. 1, ark. 18).

⁶ Manuscript Institute of the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine (hereafter cited as IR NBUV), f. 160, spr. 185-228, ark. 91v.

Faierky are also listed in sections of other researched inventories, but their designation is not specified anywhere else.⁷

Other items that could have been used at tea-time include special dishes for confections, like jelly, jam, or marmalade.⁸ For example, Mykolai Tsvit, archimandrite of Saint Cyril's Monastery in Kyiv (†1784), owned "five small, enamel cups for confections" and "one enamel tray for confections with nine enamel cups" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 178, spr. 43, ark. 17v-18).

For the most part, manufacturers of teaware are not indicated in inventories of property, although one can conjecture on the local provenance of earthenware and glass accoutrements. Other documents also contain information about Ukrainian tinsmithing and the repairing of metal plates, coffeepots, etc. (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 129, op. 2, spr. 1, ark. 22; f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a, ark. 31). Inventories of property mention the use of Russian-made dishware, including, of course, Chinese and German porcelain. The latter fact is quite interesting because it indicates the penetration of a new Western European phenomenon into Ukraine. The considerable demand for Chinese and, eventually, Japanese porcelain in Europe (both for newly fashionable collections stored in special china cabinets and for everyday use) sparked the production in the early eighteenth century, in the Saxon city of Meissen, and in mid-century, in all the German lands, of Chinese-style (and Japanese-style for some tea services) porcelain items that enjoyed both artistic and commercial success (Le Corbeiller 5-6, 8, 18). Foreign-made porcelain from the West also reached the Cossack Hetmanate. For example, a report prepared in 1766 by the Dobrianka customs office about imported goods and merchants records the importation of 848 dozen and an additional 51 items of "dishware made of ordinary porcelain, teapots, cups, tea caddies, [and] sugar bowls." It is noteworthy that during this period porcelain was supplied only by Russian merchants, although traders from the Rzeczpospolita, Old Believer merchants from the free, self-governing villages (*slobody*) of the Cossack Hetmanate, as well as entrepreneurs from Chernihiv, Nizhyn, and other populated areas also passed through this customs house (Tyshchenko, "Narysy zovnishn'oi torhivli," 365).

⁷ For a reference to a brass brazier owned by Syl'vestr Liaskorons'kyi, see TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 873, ark. 4.

⁸ For a recipe for a "rose confection," for example, see Peredriienko (80-81). This rose-based confection was also used for medicinal purposes. For example, Iakiv Markovych, whose diary does not fail to mention the question of maintaining his health, took "diarrhea medication in confections" (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik General'nogo Podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha* 1: 279).

Inventories of property owned by high-ranking monks reveal that the consumption of tea was widespread and, apparently, a common phenomenon. One can only speculate when this hot drink became a traditional adjunct to the church elite's tables, and there is little point in searching for an exact date. Neither are inventories of property owned by the clergy very helpful in establishing the lower chronological boundary because the absence of teaware among someone's belongings does not mean that this individual did not drink tea. On the contrary, there are documented references to clerics who consumed this beverage on a regular basis. However, this type of dishware is not recorded in postmortem inventories of their property.

For example, we know that Ioanykii Skabovs'kyi, archimandrite of Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery (1752–53), kept zealous watch over how his tea was prepared, but after his death the inventory of his property mentions only a sugar bowl (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 148, spr. 56, ark. 7-7v). Sofronii, hegumen of the Saints Peter and Paul Monastery (1785-86), acquired a number of tea accessories, but only two teapots are listed in the inventory of his property (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 11v, 66). Some clerics, sensing their impending death, sold off all their belonging; thus, their last wills and testaments discuss only how to divide money among their legatees. This is precisely what Feofan Zholtovs'kyi, hegumen of Saint Cyril's Monastery, did (†1762) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 157, spr. 4, ark. 1-2). Other high-ranking monks, such as Modest, archimandrite of Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery (†1768), upon reaching the end of their life, distributed their accumulated estate by themselves (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 1831, ark. 1-1v), and after the death of such individuals there was no need to inventory their property. At the present time few inventories of property owned by monks dating to the first decades of the eighteenth century have been found. In view of this, it cannot be established with any kind of certitude that the absence of any references to coffee services and teaware in the last will and testament (1726) of Khrystofor Charnuts'kyi, former rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and hegumen of Saint Nicholas's Monastery, who was afflicted with tuberculosis, signifies unequivocally that he did not own such utensils (Zadorozhna et al. 37-39, 389-90). For example, the postmortem inventory of one of his colleagues, Feodosii Hlyns'kyi (†1738), abbot of Saint Cyril's Monastery, does not record any dishware (only "four tablecloths") (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 1a, ark. 3). But this in no way means that he partook of food without using the appropriate dishware and that he ate food in its raw state.

In the process of establishing the approximate period when the church elite began demonstrating a passion for tea, we should keep in mind, first, that during the first quarter of the eighteenth century the Cossack

Hetmanate was already a transit territory through which tea was imported from Russia to points farther west. One can thus propose the cautious conjecture that familiarity with this beverage may also date to that period. Second, one should not overlook the Ukrainian clergy's shifting and active contacts with the Russian lands. They began as early as the seventeenth century; however, the most intensive period of "the influence of the Little Russian church in Great Russia" dates to the first half of the eighteenth century, and the Ukrainian clergy was already being actively exploited for various purposes by Tsar Peter I (Kharlampovich 459-67). Afterwards, presumably, the greater or lesser "mass" familiarity with tea among clergymen from the Cossack Hetmanate emerged sometime in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, with the intensification of direct relations with Russia, where at this precise time tea was gaining in popularity (more on this below), as well as in Western Europe.⁹

Indirect evidence that tea was still not widespread in the first third of the eighteenth century is provided by the lexicon used in the 1735 inventory of tea accessories owned by Veniamin, steward of Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery. The hieromonk's chamber contained tea "cups" (*finzhaly*) and "saucers" (*prystavochky*) for them (see Addendum 1). One may infer that these were teacups (*filizhanky*) and small plates, which people were still not in the habit of calling "cups" and "saucers," as happened later.¹⁰ However, even later, for example, in various versions of the 1762 inventory of the belongings owned by Meletii, a monk in the Vydubychi Monastery, "tea cups" (*chashky chaini*) and *finzhaly* appear as mutually interchangeable synonyms (cf. TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 13v, 14v). Therefore, we should reject this argument in calculating the period when this hot beverage won the favour of Ukrainian clerics.

It is difficult to establish the regularity and frequency of the consumption of tea by the clergy, all the more so as the answer to this question requires concrete proof, rather than mere generalizations.

⁹ In Western Europe the "consumption of tea . . . will become conspicuous only in the 1720s-1730s," when direct trade with China began (Brodell' 209).

¹⁰ The inventory of Veniamin's property contains other obscure entries. When the steward was away in Russia, the need arose to take one of the monastery's privileges from his chamber. Accordingly, the cell was unlocked, and an "inventory of belongings" was done. Listed in the inventory is a "grey foreign cat" (*kot serii zamorskii*) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 169, op. 5, spr. 97, ark. 4). One can only speculate what is meant here: an animal that had access to some kind of gap through which it could leave the cell during the monk's lengthy absence; a piece of fur; an inanimate object, such as a figurine (unlikely because the inventory would have had to list the material from which it was fashioned); or a typographical error (for example *kot* [cat] instead of *kots* [blanket]).

However, even discrete facts indicate that during the second half of the eighteenth century high-ranking monks perceived tea-drinking as nothing out of the ordinary. This is attested not only by inventories of their property recording tea-related dishware but also individual statements in documents. For example, Rafail, a hieromonk of Saint Sophia's Monastery and an alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy,¹¹ spent time at the Zaporozhian Sich in 1763-65, where he solicited alms together with two monks. In a letter written in 1764 to the cathedral scribe Iakiv Voronkovs'kyi, another alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, who later gained distinction among the members of the Kyivan church elite as the owner of the largest priory library in all of Kyiv,¹² Rafail made the following request: "I want to buy tea, I would like [you] to send some because you cannot obtain it anywhere in our parts" ("Perepiska," 39). Therefore, it must be inferred that this beverage, which Rafail could not do without, became one of the indispensable elements of his daily nutrition. The cathedral scribe responded by sending to the Sich "half a pound of tea . . . from the entire brotherhood," and from himself, a "lump of sugar" with the words, "After brewing tea, I wish for you and the Reverends Iafet and Hervasii to eat for your health" ("Perepiska," 41).

The frequency of tea consumption may be established approximately by observing the quantity of the dried ingredient that was acquired for the preparation of this beverage. We know, for example, that Sofronii, hegumen of the Saints Peter and Paul Monastery, purchased with his own funds two pounds of tea (nearly 880 grams) from a Kyiv merchant between the second half of March 1785 and early February 1786 (approximately a ten-month supply) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 66).¹³ Thus,

¹¹ His "Latin" erudition is indicated by the use of insertions in that language in his letters, as well as by indirect information. For example, in one text Rafail mentions his brother, Ivan Kremians'kyi, parish priest of the church in Zubivka, which was part of the Myrhorod archpriestship ("Perepiska," 27). The lists of students who attended the Kyivan Mohyla Academy in the 1750s include the names of Roman and Ivan Kremians'kyi from Zubivka, the sons of a deceased local priest. Roman began studying theology in 1754, but in December "he travelled to the Trebinskis to serve as a tutor [for their children]" (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 172, ark. 491, 493). In view of the widespread practice of adopting a new name to accompany the rite of tonsure, and keeping in mind the above-cited information, there is a high degree of probability that the student Roman may be identified as the hieromonk Rafail.

¹² The postmortem inventory of the belongings of Iakiv, hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery, lists 372 books from his own library and 16 books borrowed from other libraries, not to mention 62 bundles of documents and individual manuscripts. See Iaremenko, *Kyivs'ke chernetstvo* 159-60.

¹³ In the Cossack Hetmanate in the eighteenth century one pound equalled 393.13 grams, while the Russian pound equalled 409.512 grams (Sydorenko, *Istorychna*

according to these data, every month Sofronii consumed around 80 grams of tea, that is, a little more than 2.5 grams a day, or roughly one cup of tea, if one follows present-day standards for brewing tea that is not very strong. However, it is not known how much tea he consumed when he was a guest somewhere, how many people he himself hosted, and whether there were other sources from which the abbot obtained this product.

It should be noted that the purchase of tea and the teaware necessary for its preparation was a personal matter for each monk; that is, they used their own funds to purchase and prepare tea. At the same time, monks occasionally purchased tea with monastery funds, usually for the abbot's table or banquets attended by guests, which is practically one and the same thing because a public figure like the "head" of a monastic community always had to be ready to partake of repasts with distinguished visitors. The expenditure of monastery funds for coffee products for hegumens and archimandrites is clearly traceable in documents dating to the last third of the eighteenth century, although such purchases were not, it seems, the absolute norm (especially in earlier times); this is also corroborated by the example of the above-mentioned hegumen Sofronii. In 1768, during the preparations to welcome the newly appointed archimandrite, Saint Nicholas's Monastery acquired a quarter-pound of tea (approximately 100 grams), and the following year the monastery splurged on 50 grams "for the united brotherhood" and 100 grams "for attending guests" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262, ark. 2, 11).¹⁴ In the first half of the 1780s Saint Cyril's Monastery purchased tea for its hegumen, Kyrylo Kucherovs'kyi, as well as for hosting guests invited to celebrate feast days (Marholina and Ul'ianovs'kyi 207, 259). During such festive repasts, drinking tea was a routine phenomenon. Thus, it is no wonder that included among the dishware placed in the chambers of the Vydubychi Monastery, which were prepared for as many as forty people invited to celebrate the feast day of St. George the Martyr in 1775 (an equal number of chairs is mentioned, but only thirty knives, and even fewer vessels for

metrolohiia 159). Hereafter, all conversions to the current measurement system follow Sydorenko's publication (*Istorychna metrolohiia* 158-59). Since it is sometimes difficult to determine which unit of weight measurement, Ukrainian or Russian, is being referred to, I use the approximate weight of 400 grams, which does not substantially alter the calculations.

¹⁴ The account book of Saint Nicholas's Monastery for 1768 contains only one mention of the purchase of 50 grams of tea, without indicating the name of the consumer. However, it is unlikely that the tea was meant for the rank-and-file monks because tea was not purchased for the general community table even for important feast days, e.g., the monastery's dedication day or Christmas (see TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262, ark. 3v, 4v-5).

alcohol), was a “sieve for straining tea” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 573, ark. 36).

It is equally difficult to determine how many cups of tea were consumed by Mykolai Tsvit, former abbot of the Peking mission and archimandrite of Saint Cyril's Monastery (1783-84), whose postmortem inventory listed approximately twelve kilograms of tea (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 178, spr. 43, ark. 17). The method of estimating a cleric's love of this Chinese product according to the quantity of the purchased dried ingredient is not very reliable. Meanwhile, other data pertaining to the duties of the three servants attending Ioanykii Skabovs'kyi, archimandrite of Saint Cyril's Monastery and, later, of Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery, which he compiled in written form in 1751, reveal that tea-drinking was frequent and regular and that scrupulous attention was paid to the preparation of this beverage; two out of the three servants were responsible for the individual “procedures” for preparing tea. One of Skabovs'kyi's servants was obliged to take care of the abbot and his chamber (“by no means ever to leave the chamber without cause, to ensure that in the chamber . . . everything was clean and tidy, that clothing and other things lay in their proper place, that nothing was scattered about . . . that pillowcases were changed within an appropriate period of time”). After counting the various items, he had to bring soiled linens and other articles for washing in a timely fashion, as well as “miscellaneous things that should be remedied in the chamber properly and diligently,” and also to ensure “that beverages were always corked, so that pure and healthy tea was prepared.” Another, “junior,” servant tended to the archimandrite's dining room, especially “so that the sink, lanterns, knives, plates, and other articles, and chiefly water for preparing tea were clean” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 148, spr. 56, ark. 39–39v).

In the well-known satire “Plach kyivs'kykh monakhiv” (The Lament of Kyivan Monks, 1786), a work that makes skilful use of the discussions that took place during a synod held at the Kyivan Cave Monastery concerning the dangers of introducing secularizing reforms, one of the members of the monastery elite, the second purser [*druhyi ekonom*] Varsonofii, declares in desperation: “I see that everything is different today,/ The golden period has flown from us!/ We must prepare common hedgenettle,/ For there will be nothing with which to buy tea./ And there will be no money at all for sugar” (Myshanych 218). It seems that the inclusion of the reference about tea-drinking in this work also indicates that the high-ranking monastic brotherhood was accustomed to drinking this particular beverage.¹⁵

¹⁵ It is interesting to note that the first attempts in the Russian Empire to grow tea in the Caucasus region were made in 1833, an initiative put forward by the

For the most part, documents do not provide details of the types of beverages that were consumed by the clergy; they mention simply “tea” or “green tea.” However, individual statements indicate that the church elite was well versed in the various types of tea. Zhulan,¹⁶ an expensive, uncompressed green tea of the highest quality,¹⁷ was drunk in Kyiv. In 1767 the Belarusian bishop Heorhii Konys'kyi sent a letter from Warsaw to the bishop of Pereiaslav, thanking him for his “writing” “with the enclosed Chinese present of various types” (“Materialy” 433). The price that the high-ranking clergy paid for tea (more on this below) allows one to conjecture that low-quality bricks of compressed tea did not end up on their tables.

CONSUMPTION OF COFFEE

In the eighteenth century the high-ranking clergy also drank coffee. However, if one relies on inventories of property, this beverage was not as popular as tea. According to the contents of various property inventories—sources that are none too reliable and fragmentary, to boot—out of fourteen churchmen, seven preferred tea, one was a coffee lover, and nearly half (six monks) drank both beverages.

Coffeepots made of copper, brass, and tin of various sizes were used for preparing coffee. It is telling that lists of belongings do not single out either special cups for drinking the prepared beverage or other utensils, and a coffee mill is mentioned only once. It is possible that small mortars and pestles (*mozhchyr z tluchkom*), which are recorded in inventories more frequently, may have been used in place of coffee mills (see, e.g., Syl'vestr Liaskorons'kyi, TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 873, ark. 4). Such a conjecture is suggested by information provided by Daikokuya Kōdayū, the captain of a Japanese schooner, who, following a shipwreck in 1783, wandered throughout the Aleutian Islands, Kamchatka, and Irkutsk, finally reaching St. Petersburg, where he had an audience with Catherine II of Russia; he returned to his native land in 1792. The account of the extraordinarily observant captain, the first eyewitness to see Russia, formed the basis of *Hokusa-bunryaku* (*Brief Information About Peregrinations in Northern Waters*), a collection of Japanese observations about eighteenth-century Russia, which Katsuragawa Hoshū finished

Armenian patriarch Nerses V, together with the local vicar (Subbotin 34). This may attest to the fact that clergymen viewed tea as “their” drink.

¹⁶ See, e.g., the year 1769 (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 242, 250).

¹⁷ According to an eighteenth-century dictionary, zhulan was defined as “the finest variety of Chinese green tea” (*Slovar'*, pt. 2, col. 1196).

compiling in 1794.¹⁸ This book notes the procedure that was followed for preparing coffee in Russia: coffee grains “are roasted, crushed in a mortar, brewed with boiling water, and drunk with sugar and milk” (Khosiu 208).

In Ukraine, coffee beans were also specially roasted¹⁹ or “burned” (see Addendum 2, which mentions a sugar bowl, one of whose compartments contained “two spoons of roasted coffee”). A milk jug, included in the list of dishware owned by Kyrylo Kucherovs'kyi (see Addendum 1), indicates that milk was added to the “wine of Islam.” However, it belonged to the abbot, who also enjoyed tea; thus, it cannot be excluded that the milk pitcher was used whenever both of these beverages were served, as tea was drunk with milk in the Russian Empire. The above-mentioned account of the Japanese observer, who spent time in the company of the nobility in the Russian capital, notes that tea “is put into a silver vessel with a spout and steeped in boiling water, after which it is drunk. Sugar and milk are often added to it” (Khosiu 208).

The fact that Ukrainian Cossack officers were consuming coffee (and tea) as early as the 1720s is corroborated by the journals of Iakiv Markovych and Mykola Khanenko (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo khoruzhego Nikolaia Khanenka* 5; *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha* 1: 91, 94, 114, 207, 211).²⁰ Lidiia Hnatiuk, who drew attention to the form of the word for “coffee” in Markovych’s diary, dating to the mid-1720s—a calque of the Turkish analogue (*kahve*)—and to the special mention of occasions when this beverage was consumed, conjectures that at issue here is the “emergence of a reality into the lives of Ukrainians” and that coffee drinking was “something that was still very new and unusual for the time” (389). However, the word *kahve* is evidence, it seems, not so much of the period when this beverage was “incorporated” as of the lands from which it was borrowed. Considerably later, in the second half of the eighteenth century, the “wine of Islam” is mentioned, although in a somewhat different but similar form, *kokhve*, in documents produced by the Kish, the central body of government of the Zaporozhian Host, which

¹⁸ For detailed discussion of this work, see Konstantinov.

¹⁹ One medical treatment manual even recommended roasting medicines for internal fever “like coffee” (Peredriienko 65). Roasting coffee before drinking it is mentioned by Markovych (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha* 1: 211).

²⁰ As far as one can judge from the notes left by both of these eminent individuals (and we do not know in how detailed a fashion coffee drinking was recorded), they did not drink this beverage every day. Moreover, if one considers the time of day (when it is indicated), they usually drank it in the morning or during the first part of the day, as well as in the afternoon.

was in perpetual contact with the Crimea (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 229, op. 1, spr. 36, ark. 16).²¹

Already in the first quarter of the eighteenth century coffee was imported regularly, albeit in small quantities, to the Cossack Hetmanate from the East by a safer route across the lands of the Rzeczpospolita.²² Moreover, it seems that this merchandise was not shipped onward, that is, it was used in Ukraine. In 1717, for example, “14 oka of coffee” (nearly 18 kg) were imported to “Little Russia” “from the Turkish land and from Poland”; in 1718, “40 oka of coffee” (slightly more than 51 kg); in 1719, “8 oka of coffee” (over 10 kg); and in 1720, “32 oka of coffee” (nearly 41 kg) (Dubrovs'kyi 383-86). The Turkish traces of the practice of coffee drinking in the monastic milieu are attested indirectly by the discovery of fragments of Turkish faience coffee cups dating to the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which were found during archaeological excavations on the territory of the women’s Ascension Monastery in Pechersk (it moved to the Podil district of Kyiv in 1712), where women from prominent families became nuns. Fragments were also found in a pit dating to the eighteenth century, which was discovered on the territory of Saint Michael’s Golden-Domed Monastery (Chmil’ 69).

The fact that this beverage was not some sort of curiosity but a drink with which ecclesiastical circles were familiar in the mid-eighteenth century, at the latest, is indicated by the customary formation, from the word *kofe*, of adjectives denoting colour: “a coffee-coloured [narrow-sleeved] cassock [*poluriasok = pidriasnyk*] lined with marten,” “dark-coffee” semi-woolen fabric (1753) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 148, spr. 56, ark. 7, 28v), a “coffee-coloured woolen [wide-sleeved] cassock [*rasa = riasa*]” (1759) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 87, ark. 2), a “coffee-coloured damask [*kimchatyn*: possibly *kamka = damask*] caftan” (1764) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 159, spr. 114, ark. 18), “coffee-coloured silk [*shtof*; Pol. *sztוף*] fabric,” a “silk cassock” (1766) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 21), an “embroidered silk [*liustryna*] coffee-coloured cassock [*riasia*],” “coffee-coloured silk fabric,” a “coffee-coloured Italian shawl” (1767) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a, ark. 12-13), a “coffee-coloured cassock of Polish wool” (1773) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 22), “six worsted buttons of coffee colour” (1775) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 2313, ark. 5), a “silk, coffee-coloured shawl,” a “coffee-coloured cassock [*poluriasok*],” “coffee-coloured fabric,” a “curtain of

²¹ I am deeply grateful to Tetiana Kuzyk, who not only drew my attention to this document, but also provided me with a copy intended for publication in the corpus edition, *Arkhiv Kosha Novoi Zaporiz'koi Sichi*.

²² For a comparison of the safety of various routes, see Tyshchenko, “Narysy istorii torhivli livoberezhnoi Ukrainy,” 114.

coffee-coloured fabric [fler]" (1784) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 178, spr. 43, ark. 14, 16v–17), a "cuff of coffee-coloured silk fabric" (*kanavat*) (1786) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 10v), etc.

Like tea, coffee was an "individual" beverage, although it could have been purchased for abbots and their guests with monastery funds. For example, in 1769 Saint Nicholas's Monastery made a one-time purchase of a pood (nearly 16 kg) of coffee for its archimandrite, Epifanii Mohylians'kyi (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262, ark. 22). In the late 1770s and first half of the 1780s Saint Cyril's Monastery, preparing to welcome guests for the holidays, also spent money on coffee (Marholina and Ul'ianovs'kyi 259), and this product began to be purchased on a regular basis for the abbot's chamber no later than 1779 (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a, ark. 7v, 16v, 18, 19v, 22v, 31).²³ The latter fact allows scholars to calculate the approximate amount of coffee consumed by the archimandrite. In the space of one year, from 25 August 1779 to 22 August 1780, twelve pounds of coffee were purchased for the abbot's chamber: three pounds on 25 August, 1 pound on 27 January, 1 pound on 21 February, four pounds on 16 March, and three pounds on 21 May (the next purchase was on 22 August). On average, the abbot used one pound (nearly 400 grams) every month, or around 13.5 grams every day. Contemporary cookbooks state that a teaspoon of ground coffee weighs seven grams. We do not know what the standards were for preparing this beverage during that period. However, according to current recommendations indicated on packages of coffee (one teaspoon per single serving), the hegumen Kyrylo would have had enough for two single portions. Whether this was indeed the case cannot be established unequivocally because the archimandrite may have offered some to his guests. This is revealed indirectly by the irregularity of the coffee purchases: on one occasion, three pounds were purchased for four months; another time, four pounds lasted sixty-six days. Furthermore, we do not know if the abbot used his own funds to make additional purchases of coffee beans.

I will note another interesting fact in connection with Archimandrite Kyrylo Kucherovs'kyi's coffee consumption. The archimandrite was in poor health, which circumstance is indicated by the regular purchase of medications for him. It seems that he also suffered from digestive problems because the purchased medications included a "laxative powder," and shortly before his death Kyrylo became sick with a "serious gall bladder disease" (Marholina and Ul'ianovs'kyi 207). It may be conjectured that he

²³ For some reason, Iryna Marholina and Vasylii Ul'ianovs'kyi make the erroneous assertion that the entry concerning the purchase of coffee for the hegumen Kyrylo was recorded in the account ledgers of St. Cyril's Monastery for the year 1782 and that the abbot began drinking this beverage that year (207).

used coffee for medicinal purposes. In the Russian Empire, as in Western Europe at the time, it was believed, at least by members of the educated public, that coffee “strengthens the stomach, helps with the preparation of food, serves as an aid against headache stemming from stomach indigestion, and banishes sleep” (*Slovar'*, pt. 3, col. 882). Even earlier, in the seventeenth century, attempts were made in the Muscovite state to cultivate tea, a product that had not yet entered into mass consumption, in apothecary gardens and beds that were tended mostly by foreigners for medicinal purposes; tea was especially prized as a remedy against the ill effects of drinking (Skorokhodov 38). During the eighteenth century coffee and tea were also introduced into Ukrainian “traditional” healing methods, in which the time-tested use of herbs and liquids for curative purposes exists cheek by jowl with superstitions, magic spells, and the like.

NEW INGREDIENTS IN “TRADITIONAL” MEDICINES

First of all, I should note that the discussion here is not about “folk” medicine but about consilia (*poradnyky*, books of medical advice) that were widespread, above all among the upper classes as well as literate individuals,²⁴ including among the black and white monks. For example, the private library of Iakiv Voronkovs'kyi, hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery, also contained herbals and recently published medical literature, including *Nastavleniia i pravila vrachebniiia dlia derevenskikh zhytelei, sluzhashchiiia k umnozheniiu nedovol'nago chisla liudei v Rossii* (*Medical Instructions and Rules for Rural Residents Used for Multiplying the Unsatisfactory Number of People in Russia*), written by the physician Johann Kershtens, founder of the Faculty of Medicine at Moscow University. Among the books that the hegumen borrowed from the library of Saint Sophia's Monastery was *Kniga polska pechatanna nazyvaemaia travnik lechebnoi v list* (*A Polish Book Called a Herbal Handbook Printed in Folio*) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 169, spr. 21, ark. 25v, 27, 32). The monks of Saint Nicholas's Monastery in Kyiv not only used traditional recipes for preparing medicines, but also produced and sold these medicines.²⁵

²⁴ Commoners, most of whom were illiterate, had no use for this type of collection, into which texts from scholarly medical publications of the time were often recopied; moreover, the ingredients used in the herbal recipes (e.g., Hungarian wine, spices) were quite expensive.

²⁵ The latter conclusion is suggested by the tendency to add to a dish containing one universal cure for a whole array of ills a description of the wonder-working property of this panacea, how it was to be used, as well as its price (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 33, spr. 4, ark. 1–4v).

The use of manuscript consilia in the church milieu is indicated by their owners' inscriptions and marginalia contained in collections featuring such content, which have been preserved to this day. For example, a "book of cures" (*lichebnyk*) features in an eighteenth-century collection that contains different types of handwriting, proof that it belonged to various clerics in different periods. Here we find a notation made in the same handwriting as some of the other inscriptions. It states: "This book was copied by the servant of God, the holy priest Ioann, presbyter of Iuzefivka. In the year of our Lord 1781, the 2nd day of the month of April in Iuzefivka." There are also notes made by priests and deacons who owned this book in the nineteenth century.²⁶ Another manuscript, which is marked by various types of handwriting dating to the eighteenth century, as attested by the marginalia, belonged to a priest in 1833. Its previous owners are not indicated. However, two notations in the margins reveal that treatment was carried out with the help of the clergy, particularly black monks, and possibly even in a monastery, as the following notations appear underneath handwritten recipes dating to the eighteenth century. Below one of them it states that "it is necessary to ask Father Symeon," and underneath the other one, "the Most Venerable Father Iraklii Letushevych absolutely knows about this" (IR NBUV. DA/P.537, f. 160, spr. 87, ark. 7v, 31v, 55–57, 80).²⁷ Another manuscript that I examined indicates unmistakably that a parish deacon recopied the text (IR NBUV. DA/P.537, Nezh 146, ark. 54v); in another, the owner's (recopier's?) connection to the Church is revealed indirectly by humorous accounts included in the collection about a foolish deacon: "Nastavlennik" (The Appointee); "Zagovor na popa" (A Plot Against a Priest); "Sluzhba pivorezam i pianitsiam, slozhennaia 1740 godu v nastavlenii pianstvennago i nebogougodnago ikh zhyt'ia vo oblichenii" (A Service for Boozers and Alcoholics Compiled in 1740 As an Instruction for Exposing Their Drunken and Ungodly Life; this text contains imitations of various types of liturgical texts, including hymns [*stichera*], echos [*hlasy*], troparions, heirmos, canons, sitting hymns [*sidal'ni*], kondakions, Photogogica [hymns of light], etc.), as well as the Kyivan Cave Monastery's "Lament" of 1786 (IR NBUV. DA/P.537, f. 1, spr. 7574, ark. 59-78). Another herbal (*zil'nyk*), titled *Lekarstva opisaniie* (A Description of Medicines), dating to the third quarter of the eighteenth century, most likely belonged to a priest from Liutenka (Hadiach regiment) or a clerk of a company and simultaneously the spiritual administration, as suggested by the marginalia (Peredriienko 10).

²⁶ IR NBUV. DA/P.537. The folio before 1 (no numeration) on the verso side, 16, 73–77.

²⁷ The title of "eminence" indicates that Iraklii held the rank of hegumen.

In the opinion of Oleksandr Potebnia, who published the texts of consilia dating to the second half the eighteenth century, these texts were owned by a company or regimental officer of the Lubny regiment (92).

Last but not least, the clergy's interest in healing may have been fostered by the need to dispense advice to the laity. In the eighteenth century this aspect of the clergy's pastoral duties was even encouraged by "academic" doctors. For example, in the above-mentioned brochure published in 1769 Johann Kershtens, professor of medicine and philosophy at Moscow University, recommended that "village headmen, stewards, priests, [and] landowners and their wives" be in charge of storing medicinal herbs, distributing them among the peasantry, and carrying out consultations on the correct use of herbs, adding that "others [i.e., priests] need to do this . . . out of love for others."²⁸

In general, manuscripts of Ukrainian consilia barely mention the various medicinal effects of consuming coffee and tea, which were attributed to these beverages by Western physicians in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; for example, the ability of the "wine of Islam" to help a person regain sobriety, clear the brain, invigorate the body, improve blood circulation, decrease sexual energy, drain the body, etc. As early as the seventeenth century unique effects, similar to that of coffee, were attributed to tea: revitalization of the body, stress relief, strengthening of the stomach, liver cleansing, improved digestion, headache relief, memory improvement, etc.; tea was also celebrated as a cure for the common cold, scurvy, and fever (Shyvel'bush, 48-63, 94, 99; Brodel' 210). Thus, it is no wonder that individual physicians promoted frequent tea-drinking, a minimum of ten cups a day.

But Ukrainian "herbal handbooks" contained their own "modifications"; it is not out of the question that they were borrowed, but the issue of determining from which sources requires separate study. One particular remedy for easing lower back pain recommended the following treatment: "Soak *Cyclamen europaeum* in prepared coffee and drink it" (Peredriienko 61). The "wine of Islam" could also help treat the common cold: "For a runny nose, take a half-and-half mixture of coffee and tobacco; many are healed naturally" (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 87, ark. 80v). Coffee was recommended among "other things, sudorifics, apart from medical ones," along with deer antler, sulphur, burdock root, etc. (Peredriienko 36). These treatments coincided to a certain degree with the above-cited recommendation for drainage of the body. However, Iakiv Markovych's journal mentions other, more practical, methods for excreting body fluids:

²⁸ See, e.g., the 18th-century manuscript copy in IR NBUV, f. 1, spr. 7574, ark. 27-27v.

more or less regular “purgation.” Incidentally, I should mention here that the laxative methods recorded relatively frequently by Markovych attest not so much to chronic illness as to the author’s erudition, a kind of “prophylactic” attitude to his health as a result of his familiarity with scholarly medicine of his time.

Markovych does write occasionally that he suffered from stomach problems; at other times he took a “purgative” because he had a problem with his urine; elsewhere, he does not mention any disease, but he uses a laxative. Furthermore, his journal records cases where “an illness like dysentery” appeared the day after taking the above-mentioned medications and frequent stools (“sedes”) (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha* 1: 171). The prophylactic goal of such self-treatment was based on an idea that was prevalent in European philosophy and “academic” medicine in the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries: that bodily fluids had an important impact on health. For example, in his treatise on the soul Inokentii Gizel' explains the existence of four primary fluids that formed various types of temperament; he also elucidates the basic, secondary, natural, and anti-natural fluids in the body, which carry both vital energy and various illnesses (Gizel' 2: 365-71). Because it was thought that excessive accumulation of the above-mentioned “substance” caused all sorts of ailments, certified physicians in the eighteenth century recommended that even a common cold should be treated in a comprehensive fashion, starting with cleansing the stomach with “diarrhea” (moisture left various parts of the body precisely through this method). Purgatives were recommended, for example, even to people “who are exhausted from mourning”; draining pills were also supposed to “draw” “phlegm from the head and the brain,” and help alleviate eye disorders. It was thought that “purging” helped people afflicted by “watery edema” and that cleansing of the stomach helped free the body “of cold, phlegmy impurities.”²⁹ Moreover, diarrhea not accompanied by other symptoms, like a high temperature, was even viewed as beneficial. From the above it is easy to grasp why cleansing the stomach became a standard procedure or even a rule among the educated public. Markovych, for one, was very familiar with the medical advice of his time and was careful about his own health. Naturally, his ability to consult regularly with professional physicians played a role here. The journal of this dignitary, who was one of the most educated people of his time, does not record such an attitude to coffee. Thus, one can only guess whether coffee’s purported sudorific function is connected with the new “draining” role of this beverage, which

²⁹ See, e.g., IR NBUV, f. 1, spr. 697, ark. 8, 11, 12v-13v, and elsewhere.

was even ideologically corroborated in the writings of “progressively attuned bourgeois authors” in the West (Shyvel'bush 62-63).

According to Ukrainian consilia and the Western interpretation, tea helped reduce headaches and relieved coughs—of course, in conjunction with other procedures. Nevertheless, the goal was the same: to drain fluids from the body; in this case, by inducing perspiration. For the above-mentioned ailments, the sick person first had to place his/her legs up to the knees in steaming water mixed with hay, which produced “very considerable sweating.” Then, to intensify the effect, the patient had to drink “three cups of tea” and cover up warmly (“*Malorusskie domashnie lechebniki XVIII v.*,” Addenda 2: 43).

In addition to rare, direct precepts about the medicinal effects of coffee and tea, consilia suggested using separate tea and coffee services for administering doses of medications; it was also recommended to use their consumption as a criterion for the time and frequency of taking medications. The latter detail may suggest how and when tea- or coffee-drinking took place. For example, in one manuscript that includes a prescription for medications for the treatment of tuberculosis and other chest diseases, we read how to prepare an indispensable herbal potion, whose use was measured in cups. The recipe called for coltsfoot, “that is, butterbur or the silvery parts of wormwood leaves, veronica, cowslip” and sage: boil equal amounts of the first three, less of cowslip and sage, and “like tea, drink three cups once a day” (IR NBUV, DA/P. 537, ark. 76v). In other consilia, ingredients were measured both in teacups and teaspoons (for example, “five teaspoons”) (“*Malorusskie domashnie lechebniki XVIII v.*,” Addenda 2: 44, 48; IR NBUV, DA/P. 537, f. 160, spr. 87, ark. 77, 81v). In another “book of cures,” as mentioned earlier, the medication ingredients had to be roasted “like coffee.” However, tea figured most often as a possible base for diluting a medicinal liquid: “If there is deafness or noise in the head, it is necessary to drink violet root, crumbling it into tea or [consuming it] by itself”; “take [medications] for stone disease and drink them down with tea”; for a cough, “dilute sour cherry resin in hot tea and drink it, it is also very helpful to eat it by itself”; the treatment for acne called for using the “raks herb [possibly cottonweed—Trans.], after peeling the outer bark” in tea; for a fever, it was suggested “to drink in tea or beer” young poppy blossoms dried in the shade, then the “sick person will sleep and pain will abate.” Also useful for treating fever was blood from underneath the right wing of a young, live pigeon, to be taken in warm beer or tea in the morning and evening (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 87, ark. 80, 82v, 86-88). Another recipe was suggested to interested patients: “If someone has a headache, waste is excreted, blood from the veins comes from inside the womb, there is burning in the rectum, take dill and dill seed, crush it well, pour into warm water or drink in tea—you will recover quickly” (IR NBUV,

Nezh 146, ark. 25). “For gout,” “sage juice in tea and something warm” was beneficial. The same juice, added “to tea or another liquid,” was supposed to ease toothache (“Malorusskie domashnie lechebniki XVIII v.,” Addenda 1: 10, 16). Along with wine, tea was useful for drinking “alkermes” [a tincture of cinnamon, nutmeg, and mealybugs: Arab. *al-kermes*, “red”—Trans.], as well as for using saffron in a set of methods that were supposed to help “when colour does not go in women [a possible reference to menstrual problems—M. Ia.],” although it was recommended at the same time to take “blood-purifying” drops (“Malorusskie domashnie lechebniki XVIII v.,” Addenda 2: 48).

Coffee, too, served as a similar liquid base. In particular, “a special distending powder for wind,” prepared from a whole array of ingredients, was supposed to be added to coffee or warm beer. It was recommended to take a morning dose of powder for fever, which was prepared with crabs’ eyes, deer antler, cinnamon, and other ingredients, in coffee or a special herb- or meat-based broth. Similarly, “every morning” it was recommended to dilute in “coffee” a stomach powder made of crabs’ eyes, “root of adder’s-tongue,” etc (Peredriienko 36, 62, 83).

The recommendations contained in herbals also indicate the time and frequency of taking medications by analogy with tea- and coffee-drinking. Thus, women who did not want to bear children were supposed to “boil periwinkle root in water and drink instead of tea” (IR NBUV, f. 1, spr. 7574, ark. 44v). The “blessed thistle herb” (*carduus*, St. Benedict Thistle), boiled in water, helped “with practically all diseases,” and one had “to drink [it] every day instead of tea” (“Malorusskie domashnie lechebniki XVIII v.,” Addenda 2: 38). Similar comments lead one to infer that tea and coffee were consumed both in the morning and before sleep. In a manuscript “book of cures” (as noted earlier, possibly a monastery one), a recipe for chest pain advised the patient to wrap up at night, applying a poultice made of mustard boiled in pure water, and “to consume that bitter water with sugar on an empty stomach or at night instead of tea” (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 87, ark. 88v). “For headache with a burning fever” a consilia from the Hadiach regiment recommended “drinking boiled betony in the m[orn]ing and at night instead of coffee.” Similarly, medications for *chekryka* (an insidious internal fever) were supposed to be taken “in the morning and at night instead of coffee” (Peredriienko 19, 65).

Information about the frequent use of coffee drinks tallies partly with the above-cited observations featured in Hoshū’s book, which notes that in Russia people “eat bread and drink coffee in the morning”; coffee is drunk “in the homes of noble people” right after lunch; “in addition, they drink tea constantly” (Khosiu 208, 210).

“AND WINE GLADDENS THE HEART OF MAN”

Before I begin discussing the consumption of wine among the church elite, I must emphasize that the focus here is on the alcoholic beverage derived specifically from grapes, because eighteenth-century documents listed a variety of spirits under the general heading of “wine.” Thus, occasionally, in order to distinguish the various alcoholic beverages, the terms “spirited” (*hariache*) or “bread wine” and “grape wine” were used.³⁰ Inasmuch as the latter product was not a novelty in Ukraine, the discussion will focus only on the question of whether the church elite drank wine, and if so, what varieties.

The consumption of alcohol, including wine, among black monks is revealed by inventories of property that record the various sizes and materials (silver, gilded, crystal, “painted,” etc.) of cups, glasses (in particular, for beer and mead), and “wineglasses,” “tumblers” and “small tumblers,” cups and small cups, beakers (*pohari*), and “wine cups”—and in rather large quantities for one person. This detail plainly indicates the public profile of Ukrainian abbots and high-ranking monastery brethren, as well as of monk-professors, for whom visitors and shared meals were a customary and status-based matter.³¹ It is interesting to note that “mobile bars” (*pohrebsi*, cellarettes) were a common appurtenance among prominent monks. These were variously-sized chests with locks, usually located on the inside, for storing varying quantities of crystal or glass bottles. Such “boxes” (*puzderka*) are mentioned throughout the eighteenth century, and their terse descriptions allow scholars to gain a better idea of these items.

For example, Khrystofor Charnuts'kyi's inventory of property (1726) mentions “two German cellarettes with crystal glasses” (Zadorozhna et al. 39), and the inventory of Veniamin, steward of Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery, lists one “box” with five “bottles” (1735) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 169, op. 5, spr. 97, ark. 4). Archimandrite Ioanykii of Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery (†1753) owned a “Silesian box with seven round, crystal bottles, and three smaller, empty ones, one is missing, and at the bottom [are] two empty bottles and two glasses for water,” “a second Silesian box in which there were four large, round, crystal bottles, two smaller ones, and

³⁰ This distinction is also indicated in a dictionary dating to the late eighteenth century, which under the entry for “wine” notes both the grape-based product and “all kinds of intoxicating drinks or a strong drink made of berries or grain by distilling through a pot still. Otherwise, grain-distilled wine is called simply *horilka* [vodka], *syvukha* [incompletely rectified vodka].” (See *Slovar' Akademii Rossiiskoi*, pt. 1 [from A to G], col. 705).

³¹ For detailed discussion, see Iaremenko, “Material'nyi svit',” 27.

at the bottom, two small, empty bottles, a small tumbler with a lid, two wine glasses, and two glasses for water" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 148, spr. 56, ark. 7v). Syl'vestr Liaskorons'kyi (†1754), former rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, owned four "boxes" filled with various quantities of large and small crystal and glass bottles (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 873, ark. 3v), and Isaia (†1759), vicar of the Vydubychi Monastery, owned one "small box" with a screw-top bottle" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 87, ark. 6). Mentioned among the belongings of Syf Hamaliiia, hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery, in 1768 are "a yellow, Silesian cellarette, in it are four larger, crystal bottles, four smaller ones, with tin screws, two decanters with crystal stoppers, a gilded and floral crystal glass and a crystal, gilden lid, with an internal lock"; "a white, wood cellarette bound in iron, in it are ten ordinary crystal bottles, stoppers trimmed with copper, and two places in it are festive, with an internal lock"; a "smaller, white, wood cellarette, in it are six ordinary crystal bottles, with an internal lock bound in steel"; "a green-painted cellarette bound in iron, with an internal lock, in it are six larger, polished crystal bottles with stoppers trimmed with copper"; "a white, wood cellarette bound in iron, with an inside lock without flaps, in it are four ordinary crystal bottles and one ordinary one of blue glass" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a, ark. 15v-16). Iakiv Voronkovs'kyi, hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery (1767-74), also owned a "box" trimmed with leather, with crystal flagons [*shtofy*]," and a "large painted box, in it are three stoppered bottles" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 169, spr. 21, ark. 43; f. 130, op. 2, spr. 538, ark. 9v). In 1783 Kyrylo Kucherovs'kyi's last will and testament listed "a box with two crystal bottles" (Zadorozhna et al. 246). Other high-ranking monks and wealthier ones also had their own "mini-bars,"³² as did rather indigent, rank-and-file monks.³³ Special flasks, called *fliashky*, and box flasks (*fliashi puzderkovi*) were even fashioned for such chests, and a corresponding "bottle for wine" could be acquired separately (see, e.g., TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 169, op. 5, spr. 97, ark. 3v).

For the most part, descriptions of "cellarettes" do not give any detailed information about the purpose of their contents, but they probably pertained

³² For example, Archimandrite Ilarion (†1766), who was living out the remainder of his life in the Vydubychi Monastery, had two "cellarettes" for eight and four glass bottles" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 23v, 30). Isaia, steward of the Vydubychi Monastery, also owned a "box" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 466, ark. 32v) [repetition – see above?].

³³ See, e.g., TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1020, spr. 591, ark. 10; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 395, ark. 3; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 7v; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 11, 15, 23v.; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 723, ark. 4v; IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 12.

also to wine, as indicated by one of Skabovs'kyi's "mini-bars," which contained "two wine cups." It is worthwhile noting that various "small chests" (*larchiki*) were a typical marker of the church elite's way of life during this period. A separate group of them had "bureaucratic" designations, such as, the storing of stationery. For example, among the belongings of Veniamin, steward of Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery, were "an inkwell and a pewter sand shaker [for blotting paper—Trans.] in a new box" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 169, op. 5, spr. 97, ark. 3v). Kyrylo, archimandrite of Saint Cyril's Monastery (†1783) owned a "small chest . . . trimmed with marble, in it are one crystal inkwell, two polished crystal sand shakers, and one pair of small scissors" (Zadorozhna et al. 246). Syf Hamaliia, hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery, owned a "mini-bar" and a small wooden chest with an internal lock for a pewter inkwell and sand shaker, as well as a "small wooden chest, in it are two tea caddies and a tin sugar bowl with one inside lock" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a, ark. 15). Archimandrite Ilarion (†1766), who lived "in tranquility" (retirement) at the Vydubychi Monastery, also owned a special "travelling chest of yellow copper with a copper cover, in which there were four small copper plates, two copper saucers [*pristavochok*], two red copper [missing word/s—M. Ia.], inside it is another small pewter box with small glasses and three small copper spoons" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 29). However, the lifestyle of Iakiv Voronkovs'kyi (†1774), hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery, was the "most modern" and most bureaucratic for that time, as he owned not only a "small chest of apple wood for an inkwell and a sand shaker," but also a "cabinet of mulberry wood with four drawers and with one internal lock" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 169, spr. 21, ark. 43).

Sometimes clergymen's inventories have a separate listing for wine glasses and one for "mead" and "vodka" glasses and other types of vessels, like those owned by Ioanykii Skabovs'kyi. Veniamin, steward of Saint Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery, also owned "crystal wine goblets" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 169, op. 5, spr. 97, ark. 3); Syl'vestr Liaskorons'kyi, former rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, owned "four larger crystal wine glasses and three smaller ones" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 873, ark. 3); and Kyrylo, archimandrite of Saint Cyril's Monastery, owned four wineglasses (Zadorozhna et al. 246). In 1780 Saint Cyril's Monastery purchased for the abbot's chamber an additional twelve "wineglasses with gold, polished rims" and "six wine cups with floral ears and gold rims" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27, ark. 19a v).

The popularity of wine is revealed not just in references to appropriate glassware. In the eighteenth century this drink became the traditional gift for the higher clergy during feast days or even one of the elements of etiquette governing socializing with representatives of the church elite. For example, according to data on the expenditures of the Kyiv-Mohyla

congregational treasury, special funds were spent on wine and ceremonial bread intended to be offered as “obeisances” on different occasions to a metropolitan, a rector, monastery abbots, or professors: “one [ruble—M. Ia.] was given for wine and bread for His Eminence, when students went to thank [him] for his service and visitation”; “72 [kopecks—M. Ia.] were given for wine to the reverend archimandrite of the Brotherhood Monastery, in gratitude for his service”; “50 [kopecks—M. Ia.] were presented to [Father] Vakynau, professor of poetry, for a sermon, etc.³⁴ In the same way, after Ivan Fal’kovs’kyi returned from Hungary, he visited his former German language teacher, Master [magister] Ivan Samoilovych, “with bread and wine to show his respect” (“Akty,” no. LIX, 322). In 1760, when Feofan Zholtovs’kyi, abbot of Saint Cyril’s Monastery in Kyiv, petitioned for permission to solicit alms in the Zaporozhian Sich, he also held talks with clerics who had a lower status but were able to help him conclude them successfully, starting with wine and bread. It is hardly likely that this gesture served the purely pragmatic goal of resolving the matter successfully by means of such “offerings,” which were quite modest in terms of their cash equivalents, or as a “simple gesture of respect or love.”³⁵ In my opinion, the above-mentioned gifts were above all a demonstration of “politesse,” a kind of “diplomatic gift” that clerics used to salute each other in connection with various occasions (a church feast day, someone’s name-day, the New Year, etc.³⁶). The same was done by secular dignitaries: for example, Iakiv Markovych sent around “vodka and other things, as a sign of friendly love” (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general’nogo podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha* 1: 179).

The church elite’s habituation to wine in the eighteenth century was recorded by foreigners. For example, Pastor Christoph-Wilhelm Hegelmaier, who lived in Kyiv during the second half of the 1730s, where he socialized with the professors of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and eventually, in 1739, published his notes in Stuttgart, mentions that “they always have a supply of candies, Hungarian wine, and vodka” (Khegel’maier 97). Finally, the black clergy’s predilection for wine is reflected in satirical attacks that were written, it is believed, by a monk. In “Plach Kyivs’kykh monakhiv” (“The Lament of Kyivan Monks,” 1786), Inokentii, a member of the Kyivan Cave Monastery’s spiritual synod and the

³⁴ Only a few cases from 1752 are mentioned here. That wine rather than some other kind of alcohol is at issue here is attested by the fact that there are separate entries for expenditures on “vodka” and “sweet vodkas,” “mead,” “*syvukha*” (Zadorozhna et al. 164, 166-69).

³⁵ For examples of some of Zholtovs’kyi’s presents and the appropriate treatment of “obeisances,” see Marholina and Ul’ianovs’kyi 199, 233.

³⁶ See, e.g., references to such endowments in Marholina and Ul’ianovs’kyi 262.

senior chorister of the left side of the choir, declares: “The apostle forbids getting drunk on wine./ Why should we have not abided by his words?/ But we dealt with wine universally in all periods” (Myshanych 221-22).³⁷ The “Prybavok k plachu kyivs'kykh monakhiv” (“Supplement to the Lament of Kyivan Monks,” 1792) mentions that monks drank “Champagne wine,” noting also: “And we should absolutely forget about costly drinks./ With your own hands you should make wooden goblets out of wood,/ For your hands will no longer hold golden goblets” (Myshanych 223).

Little is known about the consumption of local wines by the church elite. In his description of Kyiv at the turn of the eighteenth century the historian Maksym Berlyns'kyi noted that “local grapes in orchards are cultivated from Taurian, Hungarian, and Wallachian varieties, but wines are not made out of berries, although at times there was a successful demand for that” (226). Indeed, in the eighteenth century other monasteries in the Cossack Hetmanate had their own vineyards. For example, in October 1760, at the demand of the metropolitan from the Mhar Monastery in Lubny, “two hundred grape vines with the roots of a young, white grape vine for cultivation” were delivered to the monastery (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 293–293v), and in September 1762 the Exaltation of the Holy Cross Monastery in Poltava sent the prelate 130 clusters of grapes from its own vineyard (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 491). The cultivation of grape vines in Ukraine during this period still awaits detailed investigation, as does research on the purpose of the harvest and the methods and volume of production of this alcoholic beverage. What is known for a fact is that grape vines were cultivated, and there were attempts to produce wine from them. However, the climate in the Cossack Hetmanate was not at all conducive to the production of fine wines. Therefore, I will focus below only on the consumption of imported wines.

The participation of Mohyla professors in the Tokay commission in Hungary, which produced wine for the emperor's table, contributed to the diversification of the church elite's wine menu. Active in the commission was the travelling (*pokhidna*) Dormition Church, whose abbots and “servitors” were dispatched from Kyiv because proper educational and cultural training was required for serving the church abroad. A well-known example of Ukrainians' participation in the Tokay commission was the dispatching of Hryhorii Skovoroda as a singer to Hungary in the 1740s. In 1775 Iustyn Fal'kovs'kyi, a hieromonk at the Kyiv Epiphany Brotherhood Monastery, who was the father of the future rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Irynei (secular name: Ivan) Fal'kovs'kyi, was appointed abbot of the Dormition Church in Tokay. Iustyn took his sons on this trip to

³⁷ For a discussion of a monk's possible authorship, see Kamanin 16.

Hungary. After his death in 1780 he was replaced by the hieromonk Aaron Pekalits'kyi, future professor of Greek in the Kyivan Athens ("Akty," no. XXVI, 185-86; no. XLIV, 258-59). In describing the participation of Ukrainians in the commission, researchers usually recount how they capitalized on the opportunity to supplement their education by attending educational institutions abroad. However, it appears that their involvement in the purchasing of wines also influenced the formation of certain gastronomical preferences. Far be it from me to suggest that Irynei Fal'kovs'kyi's passion for excessive alcohol consumption³⁸ stemmed from the time he spent in Hungary as a teenager, but there is no question that he restocked the Kyivan metropolitan's wine cellar. Returning home in 1783 "with a shipment of governmental dry wines" and consignments of liquors "for various particular persons in St. Petersburg," Ivan delivered "several bottles of dry Tokay wine" to the Most Reverend Havryil (Kremenets'kyi), which were passed on by Pekalits'kyi ("Akty," no. LIX, 320).

Hungarian and other wines may also have been purchased "locally" or in the neighbouring Rzeczpospolita, because it was precisely from there and from the Crimea, Silesia, Wallachia, and "Caesaria" that the residents of Kyiv's Podil district imported "Wallachian and other varieties of grape wines" for sale (Bolotova 21, 49). As early as the first quarter of the eighteenth century large consignments of Wallachian and Hungarian wines were brought to the Cossack Hetmanate from Right-Bank Ukraine via the Vasylykivskyi outpost. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, when the tsarist government reoriented Ukrainian trade to Russian ports, foreign wines arrived here even via Arkhangelsk (Pryshliak 63, 65-66). In 1737 "a barrel of Canary Islands wine" was purchased, with funds provided by Saint Sophia Monastery in Kyiv, for the Kyivan bishop Rafail (Zaborovs'kyi), from the Slutsk merchant Ian Khrystych for 66 rubles, as well as "a half-quart of Lagonian wine [possibly from Laconia, Greece] for his name-day"; then His Eminence received "wines from the imperial emissary" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 129, op. 2, spr. 1, ark. 32v-33). Between 21 August and 7 September 1759 alone, "three antaly [= sixty bottles; a little over 186 liters] of Hungarian wine" were purchased on the instructions of the Kyivan metropolitan Arsenii (Mohylians'kyi) (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 185-228, ark. 89). Neither was the Kyivan clergy above purchasing contraband products. In late 1772 or early 1773 Iepifanii, a monk of the Kyivan Cave Monastery, was detained at the border of the Rzeczpospolita for smuggling five *atnaly* (310.5 liters) of Hungarian wine from the Austrian lands (at a cheaper cost), which

³⁸ Irynei's tendency toward inebriety and his efforts to overcome this sin were also reflected in the pages of his daily notes. See Lozova.

purchase was commissioned by the “more senior” members of the monkish brotherhood (Kamanin 4-5).

The ramified network of Kyivan “agents” replenished church cellars in Kyiv not just with Hungarian but also foreign wines, for example, from France and Germany. In particular, the right-hand man of the Kyivan metropolitan, who ministered to the “devout” in some of the Belarusian lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, was a Slutsk archimandrite, who throughout the eighteenth century was dispatched to the confirmation of a local patron from Kyiv. However, he did not just tend to his Orthodox flock. For example, in 1767 the Slutsk abbot Pavlo sent His Eminence in Kyiv “a small barrel of French wine called Picardy, which is sold in Slutsk for four zloty a Slutsk gallon.” The abbot informed him in writing:

These wines, which can always be obtained in Slutsk, have been sent to your Excellency for your approval. There was never any Rhine wine in Slutsk (people say), and they do not know about Eremit [French wine from the L'Hermite vineyards—Trans.], concerning which I wrote to various places; I did not receive any information about them, except from Vilnius, from His Excellency of Mahilioŭ. (IR NBUV, 444/605 s, ark. 257v)

As we can see from this letter, Metropolitan Arsenii (Mohylians'kyi) ordered special varieties of wine, and in order to fulfill his wishes the Slutsk archimandrite he even involved Heorhii (Konys'kyi), who is usually presented in historical writings as an individual who was constantly engaged in defending the rights of the Orthodox and spreading education, but not as an agent who searched for alcoholic beverages.

The wine menu of the church elite was also expanded by the addition of Wallachian/Moldovan wine that, according to researchers, was found in “great abundance” in Ukraine at the time (Sydorenko, “Torhivlia,” 1060). In 1780, for example, it was purchased for Kyrylo Kucherovs'kyi, hegumen of Saint Cyril's Monastery,³⁹ and the monkish brotherhood welcomed Feodosii, one of Kyrylo's successors, when he became hegumen in 1784, with Wallachian and “*sandriis'ke*” wines; later, alcohol made of the fruits of the grape vine was also frequently purchased for guests at his table (Marholina and Ul'ianovs'kyi 207). It is worthwhile noting that this was not done for the rank-and-file monks of the monastery or monks residing in other monasteries (Marholina and Ul'ianovs'kyi 210, 230).

³⁹ Marholina and Ul'ianovs'kyi are remiss in calling this wine, as well as almonds, pepper, rice, raisins, prunes, lemon juice, etc., “exotic products” (207), or “rare products” (259). In the eighteenth century these foods were a rather common sight on the tables of the church elite; however, they were imported and thus not inexpensive.

The abbots of Saint Cyril's Monastery and their guests were supplied not only with Moldavian wines but also French ones. According to researchers, on feast days the invited guests of distinguished lay individuals and clerics were often treated to their own wine as well as Hungarian wine, wine known as *sandriis'ke*, and Champagne; for example, to celebrate Christmas in 1764 or the church feast and Easter in the 1780s (Marholina and Ul'ianovs'kyi 225, 259-61). Ledgers of expenses incurred by Kyiv monasteries also record the purchase of "wormwood wine,"⁴⁰ that is, Wallachian and Crimean wines infused with wormwood (Sydorenko, "Torhivlia," 1060). It is conceivable that *sandarys'ke* or *sandariis'ke* wine, as it is called in documents of this period,⁴¹ is strong, sweet wine from the Greek island of Santorini in the Aegean Sea or a Mediterranean product from Sardinia.

In addition to consuming fine alcohol from abroad, the church elite did not shun Crimean wines, which were easy to obtain both at home and in the Zaporozhian Sich.⁴² Inasmuch as delegations of monks and permanent missions to the New Kish for "voluntary alms" were commonplace in the eighteenth century, it was not difficult to become rich from wine. For example, Rafail, the head of the mission at Saint Sophia's Monastery,⁴³ added a postscript to his letter of 10 January 1764 to the cathedral scribe Iakiv Voronkovs'kyi: "We bow to Your Reverence with new, white Crimean wine; drink it in health, may the metropolitan himself taste it; if it is suitable, recommend [it], and do not forget all three of us, your nuisances" ("Perepiska," 34). The parcel was duly appreciated in Kyiv:

I thank you especially and very much for the Crimean wines. It [sic] is very delicious. Having drunk it with pleasure, I forgot where the stichera that was sung to you, Father Rafail, was written. I also offered that wine to His Eminence—he liked it.

The beverage was not simply to the liking of the metropolitan, the above-mentioned wine connoisseur Arsenii (Mohylians'kyi). Voronkovs'kyi

⁴⁰ See, e.g., TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262, ark. 2, 4v; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 2, ark. 1v; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a, ark. 2v, etc.

⁴¹ E.g., for the years 1768 and 1779, see TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262, ark. 4v; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a, ark. 2v.

⁴² The Zaporozhian Sich was the destination of Greek, Armenian, Serbian, and other merchants, who traded in wine, among other goods. It was purchased and delivered to the Cossack Hetmanate by traders from Left-Bank Ukraine (Tyshchenko, "Narys istorii torhivli livoberezhnoi Ukrainy," 98-103).

⁴³ According to Oleksii Kuz'muk, the "sojourn of monks from St. Sophia in the Sich is known only from the 1760s" (138). On the "begging landing parties" of other Kyivan monasteries, see Kuz'muk 129-44.

advised Rafail to purchase the drink “for His Grace’s residence in keeping with the previous register given to you: His Grace will be pleased.” At the same time, it is clear that the letter was about purchasing wine with donations collected for the needs of Saint Sophia’s Monastery: “the money for the church will return here,” that is, in Kyiv and generally throughout the Cossack Hetmanate (“Perepiska,” 35).

Besides Voronkovs'kyi and the metropolitan, this product was delivered to the cathedral vicar, and Iakiv wrote back again saying that, upon accepting “very kindly” the barrel of wine, they “did not relinquish it readily until they had emptied [it]” (“Perepiska,” 35-36). That same year, 1764, Voronkovs'kyi again received “a barrel of Muscatel” from the Zaporozhian Sich, along with the information (since he may have put in an order for it) that “new wines have not been delivered yet, and the old ones turned sour or were drunk” (“Perepiska,” 40-43). The taste of Don River wine was also known in Kyiv. In December 1759 the former otaman of the Don Cossack Host, Privy Counselor Danylo Iefremov, sent the Kyivan metropolitan Arsenii (Mohylians'kyi) “one bucket of red wine from his own . . . orchard” in Cherkasy (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 223).

Of course, not all grape-based alcoholic products purchased for the members of the ecclesiastical elite were consumed by them; they were also used as gifts for colleagues and offered to guests. For example, in 1763 Arsenii (Mohylians'kyi), a lover of “delicious” wines, sent “a small present of six bottles of Hungarian wine” to Hryhorii Poletyka for his wedding,⁴⁴ and in 1767, five “barrels” of Wallachian wine to several archbishops in Russian eparchies (IR NBUV, 444/605, ark. 396–396v). Various types of wine were not used for everyday drinking, as attested by the account books of Saint Nicholas’s Monastery and Saint Cyril’s Monastery; wine was purchased for feast days, when guests were received (see, e.g., TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a). However, the monastery’s “public” funds were used for these purchases, but abbots could “gladden their hearts” more often with grapevine products by purchasing them with their own funds and enjoying gifts of wine offered to them.

Finally, I will note that the consumption of alcohol, especially wine, by the high-ranking black clergy sometimes evolved from a pleasure into an addiction. Earlier, it was mentioned that Irynei (Fal'kovs'kyi) suffered from an addiction to alcohol. Alcoholism led to the sudden death of Ivan Samoilovych, professor of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, in 1783: “It was heard that after his customary drinking binge, he was found in his cell dead and

⁴⁴ Otdel rukopisei Rossiiskoi natsional'noi biblioteki (hereafter cited as OR RNB), f. 36, d. 1, l. 110.

naked on the floor amidst spilled or smashed bottles” (“Akty,” no. LIX, 322). It should be noted that Samoilovych was one of the few lay teachers at the academy and was only planning to “renounce the world.”

EDUCATION AND PHYSICAL PLEASURE

From the foregoing it follows that the church elite in the eighteenth century enjoyed drinking tea, coffee, and wine. Below, I will discuss whether this penchant for “hedonistic pleasures” was connected with their erudition or whether education influenced daily habits both directly and indirectly through a rise in social status.

It is worth stating at the outset that the role of a good education as a way to increase one’s prestige in the society of this period should not be overestimated. In the eighteenth century learning was truly a bridge to upward social mobility. However, opportunities for bettering oneself were not available to everyone because it was a class-based society, in which one’s background preprogrammed people’s life trajectories to a significant degree. Anyone could become a cleric, but the opportunity to carve out an ecclesiastical career occurred only thanks to “Latin schools” as well as the factor of social origin, as even the path to abbotship in a monastery was denied to commoners (Iaremenko, “Nastoiateli kyivs’kykh cholovichykh monasteryiv,” 268). Besides this rule, education served as a stepping-stone to a rise in status both within the walls of a monastery (former “academics” usually held leading positions) and in the higher-ranking church nomenklatura (up to the head of an eparchy or member of the Synod); at the same time, the lack of education in an ecclesiastical career should be viewed as an infrequent occurrence.⁴⁵ Simultaneously, every step up the ecclesiastical, hierarchical ladder was accompanied by the acquisition of certain status and corresponding changes in daily life and economic

⁴⁵ Of all the abbots of eighteenth-century Kyivan monasteries on whom there are extant data, I know only of three hegumens whose education was limited to “Ruthenian literacy” and whose abbotships were not among the most distinguished: Amfilokhii, abbot of St. Cyril’s Monastery (1769-1770), Fadei, abbot of the Saints Peter and Paul Monastery (1777-1779), and Arsenii, vicar of St. Sophia (1784). All three had previously served as abbots of other monasteries: the first and third in Russia (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 32, ark. 2-3; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1020, spr. 4629, ark. 43v-44; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 1980, ark. 5v-6). The arrival in Kyiv of poorly educated but experienced hegumens was determined in particular by the need to reward and “place” “job-seeking” abbots, who appeared in Russia after the introduction of the secularizing reform of 1764.

opportunities. The latter played an important role because funds were required to maintain habits that marked status.

The “status” aspect of consuming tea, coffee, or wine is corroborated by the above-mentioned statements about the purchase of these items by monasteries only for abbots and, very rarely, for the monastery elite (council brethren). The following eloquent episode attests to this. In 1785 the hieromonk Sofronii, who was leaving Saint Sophia’s Monastery to take up the post of hegumen at the Saints Peter and Paul Monastery, immediately purchased tea accessories (on credit) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 66). It is also noteworthy that when the belongings of the rather well-off, deceased hieromonk Meletii of the Vydubychi Monastery were distributed among the monks in 1762, the abbot’s share consisted not only of crystal glassware for alcohol but also a teapot, teacups, and “spice jars” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 14v). Similarly, in 1782, after the death of Moisei, a monk at the Vydubychi Monastery, two of his three teapots and tea saucers were given to a clergyman who belonged ex officio to the senior, high-ranking monks at this monastery (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 744, ark. 2v). In none of the cases with which I am familiar were tea accessories once owned by deceased monks given to rank-and-file monks (if these items had not been passed down to relatives). If they were not distributed among the monastic elite, they were stored together with the monastery’s “junk,” as happened in 1781 (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 723, ark. 4-7).

The “economic” aspect of these “hedonistic habits” is also very pronounced because beverages, especially tea and fine wine, did not come cheap, and required sufficient financial outlays that were directly connected with social status. Here is a list of prices for the “modes of pleasure” in the Cossack Hetmanate. In 1730 in Chernihiv a quart (1,242 grams; a Kyivan quart—857 grams) of rather inexpensive (compared to other varieties) “wormwood wine” cost eight kopecks, while a pair of good boots suitable for Cossack officers cost thirty kopecks (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo khoruzhego Nikolaia Khanenka* 16); in Kyiv in 1737 “a half-quart of Lagone [an Italian wine or Greek wine from Laconia—M. Ia.] wine (less than half a liter) could be acquired for 1.95 rubles; by comparison, a pound of dates “as an appetizer” cost thirteen kopecks at the time (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 129, op. 2, spr. 1, ark. 19v, 32v). In 1745-1748 a quart of wine of unknown provenance and “wormwood” wine cost between 6 and 12 kopecks in Kyiv; “Wallachian” wine cost between 8 and 12 kopecks (both white and red); French wine cost 20 kopecks; and “Muscatel wines” cost 30 kopecks. At the same time, a pound of pepper could be purchased for around 20-40 kopecks; sugar for 22-25 kopecks; caraway seed or almonds for 20 kopecks; yellow ginger (that is, turmeric—Trans.) for 15 kopecks; white ginger or dates for 10 kopecks; olives for 14 kopecks; large raisins

for 6–8 kopecks; small raisins for 20 kopecks; and rice for 6–9 kopecks. Local foods cost less; thus, one *diinytsia* (lit. “milk pail”; nearly 71 kg.) of millet cost 75 kopecks; buckwheat groats, 30 kopecks; one hundred “soft *bublyky*” (rolls similar to bagels—Trans.), 7 kopecks; and a pot of strawberries, 9 kopecks. A pound of fresh—not inexpensive—sturgeon fish cost 3-4 kopecks; “freshly salted sturgeon” cost 1.5 kopecks; and caviar or “freshly salted caviar” cost some 8 or 9 kopecks. “Three thousand mushrooms” cost one ruble, and a quarter of oil could be purchased for two kopecks. At the time, two or three wheat rolls, depending on their size, could be purchased for one kopeck; in 1747 Saint Cyril’s Monastery paid 1.1 rubles for three large pigs and three piglets, and 20 kopecks for 40 “bunches of grapes.” In Kyiv in the second half of the 1740s boots cost between 20 and 50 kopecks (the most expensive ones were “German”); “tailored” trousers cost 8-9 kopecks, while “cloth” pants cost 18 kopecks; shirts, 12 kopecks; a cubit (an arshin) of cloth, 2-3 kopecks; crash (*krashenyina*; printed fabric) cost 10 kopecks; and a libra (appr. 327.45 grams—Trans.) of paper cost between 7 and 12 kopecks, depending on the quality (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 2, ark. 1-5v, 6v, 7v-9v, 10v, 11v-12, 13v-16, 19v-20, 21-21v, 22v, 23 зв., 25v, 27v-28, 30, 35v, 39v-40v; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 5, ark. 19, 26, 27v-28, 29, 32, 34, 35v, 37-38, 39).

In 1759 Hungarian wine purchased for the metropolitan of Kyiv cost 75 rubles an *antal* (a little over 62 liters); that is, for one liter of this beverage you had to spend 1.2 rubles, with which you could purchase five pounds of bitter almonds or approximately 0.75 kg of “Canary Islands sugar” at the Romny market (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 185-228, ark. 89, 92, 93v). In Kyiv in 1760 a quart of wine of unknown provenance cost around 12-13 kopecks; for 12 kopecks monasteries purchased “service” or “church” wine for church purposes. By comparison, a pound of “Canary Islands sugar” cost 33 kopecks; sturgeon, 4 kopecks; a whole lamb carcass, 30 kopecks; and 7 chicken eggs, 1 kopeck (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 9, ark. 5v-6, 12, 15v, 23, 25). In 1764 Saint Cyril’s Monastery in Kyiv purchased a quart of vodka from a tavern in the district of Ploske for 5 kopecks, while a quart of wine (its varieties are not listed in the document) sold for 14 kopecks in Kyiv at the time. In order to earn enough for one liter of this drink, it was necessary, for example, to saw wood for two days in the winter (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 10, ark. 1, 15v, 33-34).

In subsequent years the price of wine did not change. Thus, in 1768-1769 wine, whose provenance is not indicated in documents (very infrequently it was noted that this was white wine or wine purchased from a Greek merchant), cost 12-16 kopecks in Kyiv and as much as 20 kopecks (especially “white wine for a feast day”); the price of “wormwood wine” was 14 kopecks; and “sandaryske wine” cost 30 kopecks a quart. During

this period a quart of good-quality, strong, foreign alcohol—"French vodka"⁴⁶—cost between 0.8 and 1.2 rubles, and a bottle of "English beer" could be purchased for 70 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262, ark. 1-2v, 4-4v, 11, 12v-13, 15v-16v, 20).

In Kyiv in 1779-1781 you could buy a quart of French wine for 25 kopecks; "monastery" wine for 16-20 kopecks; "Muscatel wine" for 40 kopecks; wormwood wine for 15-16 kopecks; wine of unknown provenance (the archimandrite of Saint Cyril's Monastery drank it) for 27 kopecks; a bottle of Champagne for 2 rubles; and a bottle of "Hungarian wine" for 1.2-1.4 rubles. It was cheaper to purchase "old Hungarian" wine, which cost 80 kopecks a bottle. A quart of wine, which Saint Cyril's Monastery gave as gifts to the Most Reverend and other clergymen, cost 15-18 kopecks. It is noteworthy that the quality of beverages is indicated not only by price but also by packaging: besides Champagne, only Hungarian wine was sold in bottles. In comparison, a quart of local, high-proof alcohol made of "frozen mash" (*vymorozky*) cost 25 kopecks; "French vodka," 40-70 kopecks, and a bottle of "English beer," 40-50 kopecks. Meanwhile, it cost only 10 kopecks to have a pair of "monastery boots" made (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a, ark. 1-1v, 2v, 6v, 9, 11, 15, 17v-18, 19a, 21, 22, 24v-25, 27-29, 32, 34v-35, 36, 38-39, 41-43, 44v-45v, 46v).⁴⁷

The high cost of tea in the eighteenth century also clearly points to its potential purchasers. For example, in Moscow in the winter of 1729 Iakiv Markovych bought some "mediocre tea for 2 r[ubles] a Muscovite pound" and "good tea for 6 r[ubles] a Dutch pound" (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha 2*: 280-81). Prices in Ukraine would have been higher. Later, in 1745, "a pound of green tea" in Kyiv cost 2.5 rubles (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 2, ark. 4), and in the Cossack Hetmanate during the second half of the 1760s it cost 3 rubles, that is, the price of two fattened pigs. By comparison, a bucket of vodka could be purchased for 2.4 rubles, and *syvukha* for 1.2 rubles (Mordvintsev 28). In 1768-1769 a pound of tea could also be bought for between 2.5 and 3.2 rubles in Kyiv (it was drunk by abbots) and for 2.8 rubles (for an accommodating guest, who was helping to settle the monastery's court cases), and for under 1.1 rubles (for the monastery brethren). Meanwhile, the same quantity of lemon juice cost 8 kopecks, and sugar or the finer sort of "Greek soap" cost 25 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262,

⁴⁶ According to Hoshū, "French vodka," or punch, was regarded as a high-grade alcohol: "This wine is so strong that if it is drunk in its pure form, everything burns in the mouth. For that reason, it is mixed with warm water: eight parts water to two parts punch, and people drink it, adding sugar to the mixture" (Khosiu 208).

⁴⁷ In the first half of the 1780s the price of a bottle of Champagne remained the same (Marholina and Ul'ianovs'kyi 259).

ark. 2-2v, 3v, 11, 20, 22). In 1786 a pound of green tea cost between 2.5 and 3 rubles in Kyiv. By comparison, a pound of sugar could be purchased for 30 kopecks; pepper, for 65 kopecks; and a pound of “wove paper,” for 60 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 66). By the end of the century, this Eastern product cost “between 1 and 5 silver rubles for 1 pound,” at least in the Russian lands (Khosiu 208).

The high cost of tea was determined by the high customs duty on its importation (in the first half of the eighteenth century merchants were charged customs duties twice), which in turn depended to a significant degree on the state of diplomatic relations with China (Subbotin 469). Whereas imperial tariffs for European trade in 1724 on the importation of a pood of coffee called for customs duties in the amount of one ruble, ten kopecks a pound were levied on the importation of tea, and another three kopecks a pound for subsequent exportation out of the state. Henceforward, the percentage of taxation stimulated the coffee trade even further. In keeping with the tariff of 1731, which listed tea in the highest taxation category, 20 percent (compare: the customs duty for importing coffee grinders was 6 percent), an importer had to pay less than 40 kopecks for a pood of coffee, and 10 kopecks for a pound of tea (Kozintseva 204, 211). According to the law, in 1754 coffee was imported duty-free, while a pound of tea cost two rubles in customs duties. Starting in 1782, the tax on a pood of coffee was two rubles, and for a pound of tea, eighty kopecks.

Tariffs pertaining to the Russian Empire’s Asian trade in 1752—tea being imported mostly through the eastern borders of the state⁴⁸—stipulated customs duties on the importation of tea, which depended on the variety and quality of the product. The highest customs duty was levied on a pound of *zhulan* tea: 2.5 rubles (approximately 100 rubles a pood). Eighty kopecks were charged for “ordinary black” tea; 50 kopecks for “green tea”; 30 kopecks for low-quality “brick” tea; 30 kopecks for poor-quality “brick” tea; and 20 kopecks for “Lùgǎng” (approximately 8 rubles a pood). During this period the tax on a pood of coffee passing through Asian customs houses was 8 rubles (coffee was imported to the Cossack Hetmanate, at least during the first quarter of the eighteenth century, via “European” borders). The next tariff law, introduced in 1761, does not mention coffee, but tea was now taxed by the pood and specifically depending on the variety: “Zhulan, monikh, tsytsun, green lovkhovoi” were taxed 7.08 rubles, “ordinary green in bakchas [containers, boxes] and loose, 2.36 rubles; “Luhan and brick and all kinds of inferior [teas],” 94.5 kopecks; “black leaf tea in boxes and bakchas,” 4.72 rubles; and “stone-pressed” tea, 9.44 rubles

⁴⁸ As the sharp-eyed Hoshū noted in the late eighteenth century, tea was also imported from Turkey, the main supplier of coffee (Khosiu 192, 208).

(*Polnoe sobranie zakonov* 1: *Otd. pervoe* 46, 100; *Otd. vtoroe* 116, 240; 2: 32, 74).⁴⁹

Coffee was cheaper to purchase than tea. In 1725 Iakiv Markovych used the “wine of Islam,” 5 oka (6.4 kg) of which cost 98 gold pieces and 7 *shahy* (nearly 20 rubles), or slightly more than 3 rubles a kilogram (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha* 1: 211). In May 1730 Mykola Khanenko paid 46 kopecks for 2 pounds of coffee in Moscow (Lazarevskii, *Dnevnik general'nogo khoruzhego Nikolaia Khanenka* 5). In later years it was more expensive in Ukraine, although in the next decades the price (at least the nominal one) of this product dropped. In the second half of the 1760s a pood of coffee in the Cossack Hetmanate cost 12 rubles and 80 kopecks, or approximately 80 kopecks a kilogram. In comparison, a pood of rice could be purchased for 3 rubles, and sugar for 8 rubles and 60 kopecks (Mordvintsev 28). In Kyiv in 1769 a pound of coffee sold for 40-45 kopecks, although it was cheaper to buy wholesale: 13 rubles a pood (approximately 80 kopecks a kilogram) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262, ark. 15v, 22). In Kyiv in 1779 a pound of coffee cost 33 kopecks and in 1780-1781—30-35 kopecks (compare: a pound of sugar cost 32-36 kopecks; almonds, 30 kopecks; olives, 14 kopecks; raisins, 13 kopecks) (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a, ark. 7v, 16v, 18, 19v, 22v, 25, 31, 42).

As we can see, the difference in prices between the Chinese beverage and the “wine of Islam” was quite tangible, despite the fact that less dry product (in weight) was used for brewing tea; according to contemporary tea-making standards, a third or a quarter of the volume of coffee. In eighteenth-century England tea also cost more than coffee in absolute terms, although the smaller amounts required for preparing tea made it a less expensive beverage (Shyvel'bush 98). In any case, not everyone could afford to purchase these “modes of pleasure.” Furthermore, expenditures increased with the need to purchase tea and coffee accessories of appropriate “status” quality. Thus, dependence on caffeine was directly related to material well-being and social status. The purchase of tea and coffee at public expense for “heads” of monasteries was mentioned earlier. On occasion, monastery funds were also used to purchase the appropriate accessories (usually for hosting guests). It is revealing that they were stored frequently in abbots' chambers. For example, in 1758 the Vydubychi

⁴⁹ “Monikh” is obviously the morning variety of black tea, which the Russian Empire purchased in the following century as well. It originated in the Chinese province of Jiangsu and was regarded as a rather high-quality product. During the production of loose (leaf) varieties, various tea wastes (tea sweepings, small leaves, stalks, etc.), called huasian, formed the basis of Luhan tea. It remained a loose tea, while pressed tea waste was used in the production of “brick” tea (Subbotin 65, 68).

Monastery's "two copper teapots" were kept in the hegumen's chambers (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 128, ark. 2v). In 1769 Saint Nicholas's Monastery purchased, during its pre-holiday shopping expedition, not only food supplies, including five pounds of coffee, but also a dozen "teacups . . . at 70 ko[pecks] a pair"; that same year a pair of porcelain cups was purchased for the archimandrites' chambers (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 262, ark. 15v, 17v). Among the personal belongings that were inventoried after the death of Iakiv Voronkovs'kyi, hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery, were the monastery's "seventeen pairs of teacups" (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 672, ark. 58). In 1779 Saint Cyril's Monastery used its own funds to purchase a teapot and a coffeepot for the abbot's chambers of Archimandrite Kyrylo, and the following year, "6 pairs of white Saxon [tea] cups with handles," a yellow copper teapot, and a milk jug (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a, ark. 7v, 19a v, 22v, 31). Former abbots, usually from Russian monasteries, who were living out the rest of their lives in Ukraine, where they had made their vows, also acquired indispensable dishware from monasteries. For example, a monk at the Vydubychi Monastery, who later became the hegumen of the Meshchenskii Iukhnovyi Kazan Monastery of the Krutyts'kyi eparchy, after returning to the Vydubychi Monastery, where he had made his vow (1766-1768), kept the monastery's dishware, among which were 17 pairs of "teacups," in his chamber (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 46v).

The inventories of high-ranking monks' private property reveal that the dishware that they used for preparing and drinking coffee had a strictly utilitarian character. These documents hardly mention any silver coffee and tea accoutrements that, like other, similar, items in the Early Modern period, served as a means of accumulating wealth.⁵⁰ This type of dishware, as attested by the dowry register of the daughter of "army colonel" Pavlo Skorupa in 1773, was a costly pleasure. For example, a "tea sugar bowl weighing 52 gold pieces" cost 20 rubles and 80 kopecks; a "coffeepot weighing 1 lb. and 48 gold pieces" cost 75 rubles and 40 kopecks; a "milk jug weighing 60 gold pieces" cost 25 rubles and 40 kopecks; a "strainer for tea [weighing] 7 gold pieces" cost 3 rubles and 8 kopecks; and "12 teaspoons weighing 46 gold pieces" cost 19 rubles and 40 kopecks

⁵⁰ Obviously, there were exceptions. For example, at the time of his death in Tver, when he was en route to St. Petersburg, the Kyivan metropolitan Ioasaf (Krokovs'kyi) owned, among other pieces of silverware, six cups for unidentified beverages. Clearly, the prelate did not know for how long he was to be convoyed in Russia, so he took his most precious treasures with him (N. Vysotskii, "Delo o pozhytkakh kievskago mitropolita Ioasafa Krakovskogo: Rukopis'," IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 1559, ark. 2, 8). Similarly, abbots of wealthier monasteries, especially the Kyivan Cave Monastery, had more opportunities to accumulate silver.

(Savitskii and Savitskii 110).⁵¹ In 1772, by comparison, of the 200 rubles that were allocated every year from the General Military Treasury to the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and divided among the professors and which were also intended for “school” renovations, the largest amount, sixteen rubles, went to the rector (who was also a professor of theology and an archimandrite). Meanwhile, an inspector who was fortunate enough to become a teacher of Hryhorii Poletyka’s children, was promised a yearly salary of 20-30 rubles (Zadorozhna et al. 220-21, 222). In the mid-1770s you could purchase one cubit (58.5 cm) of woolen cloth for 1.05 rubles (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 514, ark. 4v); for 10 rubles, a coat covered with nankeen made of Crimean “newborn lambskin” [*shmushkov*]; for 4.5 rubles, a new nankeen caftan; for 2.5 rubles, a [New] “Testament” of quarto size; and for 4 kopecks, an arshin (72 cm) of ordinary cloth (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 553, ark. 1).

It goes without saying that even accessories made of less expensive materials were not accessible to everyone. For example, in 1758 a used copper teapot was sold for 60 kopecks; that was the amount at which this article belonging to liesei, former abbot of the Vydubychi Monastery, was appraised. The monk’s estate was valued at 48 rubles and 80 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 128, ark. 1v), that is, the value of the teapot comprised a little over 1 percent of the estate. After the death of Syf Hamaliia in 1767 his “Chinese porcelain teapot, a porcelain handle on top,” was valued at 25 kopecks; a “white porcelain teapot with a beautiful picture of trees and houses on both sides,” at 20 kopecks; a pair of porcelain cups, at 15 kopecks; “a small pewter straining spoon for tea,” was valued at 2 kopecks; a brass coffeepot—25 kopecks; “one brass tea caddy”—20 kopecks; “a brass sugar bowl”—20 kopecks; “a large, brass teapot”—70 kopecks; “a wooden grinder to grind coffee, brass on top of it”—20 kopecks; “a small wooden chest, in it two tin tea caddies and a sugar bowl with an internal lock”—50 kopecks; “a red, woolen cloth for a table laid for tea”—50 kopecks; and “three Chinese copper and enamel cans,” each costing 30 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a, ark. 30, 31–31v, 32v). Therefore, in order to purchase the most basic—and

⁵¹ In 1758 the dowry of Paraska Skorupa, the daughter of a fellow of the standard [*bunchukovyi tovarysh*; a rank slightly lower than that of a colonel in the Zaporozhian Cossack Host] included a silver teapot and teaspoons as well as porcelain cups (Lazarevskii, *Sulimovskii arkhiv* no. 162: 237-38). Of course, the secular nobility also used more modest tableware. For example, in 1776 Brigadier Iakym Sulyma acquired a coffeepot, tea caddy, and sugar bowl made of red copper (Lazarevskii, *Sulimovskii arkhiv* no. 91: 116). In the eighteenth century, silver coffee services and porcelain tea services were part of the consumer culture of the French urban elite (Darnton, 164).

not new—set of dishware for tea-drinking consisting of a copper kettle for boiling water, a porcelain teapot for brewing tea, copper tea caddies and sugar bowls, a “straining spoon,” and one porcelain cup, it was necessary to spend around 1.5 rubles. A copper coffee pot and sugar bowl, as well as a coffee grinder, cost 70 kopecks. However, the listed elements were the absolute minimum of what was needed in order to derive pleasure from these beverages, because coffee lovers also had to purchase coffee cups, a milk jug, spoons, saucers, and the like. It should be noted that the amount of money needed for purchasing the appropriate dishware is quite large, because an inferior horse could be purchased for three rubles,⁵² and in the 1760s a mandatory, annual ruble tax on each house was levied on the tax-paying population of the Cossack Hetmanate. In the Chernihiv regiment during the second half of the 1760s you could buy a horse-drawn cart for 40-50 kopecks, a plow for 12 kopecks, a full-grown adult sheep for 50 kopecks, a piglet for 4 kopecks, a chicken for 2 kopecks, a sheepskin for 1.2 rubles, and boots for between 20 and 40 kopecks (S[umtsov] 697).

During the 1770s the price of teaware remained unchanged; thus, a used “small, brass teapot with a pewter lid” cost 30 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 553, ark. 1). In 1779 a teapot and a coffeepot (possibly large ones for holding larger quantities of liquid for a group of people) were purchased for the abbot’s chambers in Saint Cyril’s Monastery for 2.56 and 2.1 rubles, respectively, and the following year “6 pairs of white Saxon [tea] cups with handles” were bought for 3 rubles, a brass teapot for 1.6 rubles, and a milk jug for 55 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 888, op. 1, spr. 27a, ark. 7v, 19a v, 22v, 31).

In the mid-1780s utensils for preparing and consuming tea were also not inexpensive items. In Kyiv the hegumen of Saints Peter and Paul Monastery purchased “a teapot, cups, a tray, a strainer, a small spoon, and a pencil, and spent all the money”: 5 rubles and 87 kopecks.⁵³ Additional tea accessories also significantly raised the cost of indulging one’s passion for caffeine. For example, in 1744 “a large tablecloth for drinking tea” cost one ruble (Lazarevskii, *Sulimovskii arkhiv* no. 154: 219). Naturally, much cheaper utensils made of clay, wood, and pewter were also available. In 1766 “a pewter teapot with a wooden handle” could be purchased for 15 kopecks, and an old one for two times less. Meanwhile, a used “clay teacup” or one made of wood cost between 1 and 2.5 kopecks, and a “clay teapot” cost 3.5 kopecks (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 10v, 12, 13v). Thus, accessories for a modest tea “ceremony” that was not fitting for high-

⁵² This was the sum at which Syf Hamaliia’s horse was valued (“one old bay horse”: TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a, ark. 34).

⁵³ TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 66. Unfortunately, the cost of a pencil is not singled out.

ranking monks could also be acquired for 15-20 kopecks. Nevertheless, the cost of tea alone meant that its consumption was not generally accessible.

However, it cannot be ruled out that the consumption/non-consumption of Eastern beverages by those who could afford it was determined not only by status and financial circumstances but also by personal preferences. After all, inventories of property owned by rather well-off monks sometimes do not even mention any teaware and coffeeware; for example, Isaia, abbot of the Vydubychi Monastery, whose estate after his death in 1759 amounted to 40 rubles and 60 kopecks, and 320 rubles in cash, with nothing indicating a passion for caffeine (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 87, ark. 2-6v).

It seems that the “direct” impact of education on gastronomic preferences can best be seen in the culture of tea-drinking. It would be superfluous to remind readers of the “Little Russian influence on Great Russian church life.” Hundreds of Mohyla graduates, after being tonsured and ordained, moved to Russia, especially during the first half of the eighteenth century. Many of them returned later to Ukraine to live out the rest of their lives “in tranquility.” For the most part, those who left for “Great Russian” service retained their ties to Kyiv. The substance of these relations has been studied insufficiently. Nonetheless, the correspondence of the Kyivan metropolitans, at least, indicates that people in Ukraine were aware of the latest news about Russian events and church politics, and they used their countrymen to resolve their own “questions.” Perhaps the metropolitans of Kyiv, who received letters from Mohyla graduates sent from Constantinople, Warsaw, and Slutsk, from Russian archbishops and Eastern patriarchs and metropolitans (the representatives of the latter frequently solicited alms here), and from their residents in Moscow and St. Petersburg, sensed the taste of the former grandeur of this important Christian center. Tea made its appearance in Ukraine together with Ukrainians from Russia who were returning home, along with their letters from there, which were transmitted “when the opportunity arose” (complaints about postal delivery commonly featured in the correspondence of the day).

It is important to keep in mind that the Russian state was the third largest (after England and the Netherlands) supplier of this Chinese product in the eighteenth century (Brodell' 210-11). The Tsardom of Muscovy, if one excludes Siberia, became acquainted with tea in 1638, as a result of diplomatic contact with the Altyn Khans. There are no grounds for dating the beginning of tea's popularity earlier than the late seventeenth century. That was when tea became the beloved drink of the imperial capital, where in the last quarter of the century a rather large volume of tea was sold in marketplaces. Later, this beverage began to spread to large cities and eventually among well-to-do peasants. In the 1720s tea enjoyed a

surge of popularity, although it took decades for this beverage to be adopted by broad segments of the population. Thus, even in the late nineteenth century this beverage was not consumed in remote Russian villages. As of 1790, six grams of tea was consumed per capita, meaning that it had still not become accessible to everyone (Subbotin 189, 191, 193, 220). Some sources indicate that Russia in the eighteenth century purchased a large volume of green tea varieties, and of a higher quality than those that Western Europe supplied by sea (Brodell' 210-11). However, as mentioned earlier, high customs duties made this Chinese product quite costly; therefore, there is every reason to discuss the trade in smuggled tea,⁵⁴ an activity that was also quite common among European suppliers of this period (Subbotin 579).

The well-preserved correspondence of the often-mentioned Metropolitan Arsenii (Mohylians'kyi) clearly illustrates that a gift of tea as part of the communication between Ukrainian and Russian correspondents during this period was a polite sign of respect, along with other presents, such as books (which were mutually exchanged⁵⁵) or new calendars accompanying New Year's greetings (large and small, "ordinary" and "court" ones, historical and geographical, etc.).⁵⁶ His package is frequently mentioned in "brief notes" (*tsyduľky*) attached to letters. In late November 1757 His Eminence Syl'vestr (Hlovats'kyi), bishop of Suzdal, who was of Ukrainian descent, presented a "generous [quantity of] tea" to Arsenii (IR RNB, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 37). A postscript to a letter written by Tymofii (Shcherbats'kyi), metropolitan of Moscow, to his successor on the Kyivan throne, and sent in February 1758, states: "I make obeisance to Your Eminence with a bakcha of green Boulanger tea, which I ask you to accept and use in health" (IR RNB, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 26). Extending New Year's greetings to Arsenii in January 1760, Pakhomii (Symans'kyi), bishop of

⁵⁴ For an eighteenth-century reference to it, see Subbotin 579.

⁵⁵ See, e.g., the shipment from Kyiv of a newly published bible to the metropolitan of Moscow in IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 190-91.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., IR NBUV, 444/605 s., ark. 498-498a, 525; OR RNB, f. 36, d. 1, l. 31, 60. Ukrainian correspondents usually sent local "fruits of the earth" as gifts. For example, in 1768 Luka, the archimandrite of Lubny, personally offered the Kyivan metropolitan two horses, both of them "German stallions" (IR RNB, 444/605 s, ark. 546). It was also customary to offer gifts of fruit, mushrooms, and fish, especially sturgeon (IR RNB, 444/605 s, ark. 822; IR RNB, 444/605 s, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 33, 46, 292-292v), or local spirits and, less often, sugar (IR RNB, f. 160, spr. 424, ark. 72). People in Zaporozhian Sich made "obeisances" with cash, fish, salmon, and even goods delivered there by foreign merchants, e.g., lemons (IR RNB, 444/605 s, ark. 829; IR RNB, f. 160, spr. 424, ark. 239; IR RNB, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 335).

Tambov, who was a nobleman by birth,⁵⁷ added the following lines to his letter: “Although it is a completely meager quantity, I humbly ask Your Eminence to accept graciously the gift sent with this to Your Eminence, consisting of three pounds of zhulan tea, as a true sign of my abundant fervour and regard for Your Eminence” (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 242, 244).

Bishop Syl'vestr of Suzdal, mentioned above, extending his best wishes to Arsenii in late January 1760 in connection with the upcoming Lenten period, sent “a small present of white crepe for a hood and a pound of zhulan tea” (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 243-243v, 250). The Ukrainian protopresbyter Ioan Komarovs'kyi, attesting to his respect for the metropolitan, wrote the following from Moscow on 5 August 1760: “In testimony to my esteem, I earnestly offer a bakcha of tea that I most humbly ask you to accept graciously with your metropolitan’s right hand” (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 289-290). In February 1761 “the humble servant and Pereiaslav pilgrim and New Jerusalem toiler Amvrosii” (Zertys-Kamens'kyi), a graduate of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, appended a “brief note” to a letter sent from the New Jerusalem Monastery, informing Arsenii of the following: “As a sign of my respect for Your Eminence, with this I am sending two pounds of green tea and six cans of Provençal wood oil, which I ask that you kindly accept” (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 325). In December of that year Tikhon, archimandrite of the Nizhelomovskii Kazan Monastery, added a postscript to his letter to the Kyivan metropolitan, informing him about the delivery of a pound of tea (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 383, 386).

We see the same thing in the Kyivan metropolitan’s correspondence in the second half of the 1760s. On 13 February 1767 Archbishop Veniamin (Putsek-Hryhorovych) of Kazan, who was a native of the Lubny area and a former student (*studioz*) of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, informed him in a “brief note” appended to his letter to his Kyivan colleague: “I am sending Your Eminence a bakhcha [var. of bakcha] of tea. Please accept it graciously” (IR NBUV, 444/605 s., ark. 304a); on the reverse side of a letter dated 8 April 1768 Bishop Kyrilo (Floryns'kyi) of Sevsk, who was also educated in Kyiv, wrote the following note: “I am sending Your Eminence a pound of green tea; please accept [it] kindly and use it in health” (IR NBUV, 444/605 s., ark. 673v). Ukrainian clergymen who were temporarily in Russia on business presented tea to the metropolitan. In illustration of this, I will cite the following example. In March 1766 Sava, the cathedral ecclesiarch of Saint Sophia’s, wrote a letter to the metropolitan, at the end of which he added these words: “I am sending Your Eminence a bottle of

⁵⁷ His noble origins are indicated by Kharlampovich (468).

such tea that it is impossible to find better in Moscow. I wish Your Eminence to drink it in health” (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 424, ark. 199v). The adoption of the practice of offering presents consisting of this Chinese product as a sign of courtesy and goodwill is attested by another fact. In 1759 Arsenii (Mohylians'kyi) made a special effort to send twenty rubles to St. Petersburg to his permanent correspondent, the college assessor Hryhorii Poletyka, so that he could purchase “tea and sugar” for himself (OR RNB, f. 36, d. 1, l. 11-12). The metropolitan himself also ordered tea and teaware, among other things, in Russia.⁵⁸ In a letter dated 16 June 1759 and sent from the imperial capital by the “most humble and faithful servant,” Oleksii Vierovs'kyi not only provided the metropolitan with the latest news, but also informed him that “with this I am sending Your Eminence, my gracious sovereign father, a teacup and a bottle of tea as promised by me (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 183).

Coffee as a gift from Kyivites who contributed to the renowned “Little Russian influence” is mentioned more rarely. For example, the hieromonk Pakhomii, chaplain of the Russian residential court in Constantinople, concluded his letter from Istanbul to the metropolitan of Kyiv, dated 28 February 1761, without failing to make the indispensable gesture of politesse. He declared that he would be delighted “if he were honoured by the acceptance of an oka of coffee sent by me” (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 343).

Of course, tea also arrived directly from China, brought by Kyivites serving in the Beijing mission. A good illustration of this is the 1784 inventory of property owned by Mykolai Tsvit, archimandrite of Saint Cyril's Monastery and the former head of the Beijing mission. Several chests listed in it contained the most diverse—but mostly silk—fabrics: satin, fler (a transparent fabric, usually made of silk), kamfa (probably kamcha, a floral-patterned silk fabric—M. Ia.), fanza (a Siberian-Chinese silk fabric), brocade, crepe, velvet, and the like; their Eastern, particularly Chinese and Persian, origins are occasionally indicated unambiguously or they are not difficult to deduce. The late Tsvit also owned other items of Chinese workmanship, which were rather surprising for a monk: “two Chinese robes of blue satin woven with gold on the edges of the sleeves”; “two robes of the same Chinese yellow satin with herbal patterns of the same colour”; “one Chinese robe of floral-printed silk fabric [*bilokos*, possibly *belle d'Ecosse*—Trans.]”; another eight Chinese “robes,” one of which “has an embossed Chinese painting,” and other fabrics made of brocade, satin, and retseta (an imported fabric of unknown provenance), shimmered with red, dark-red, purple, and yellow shades and featured

⁵⁸ E.g., tapestries and fabrics (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 518, ark. 413v-414).

floral and “herbal” designs. The inventory of Tsvit’s estate also lists “one Chinese shirt of green fanza” and two white and one sky-blue Chinese silk shirts; “one semi-satin lining of a Chinese robe of a pale pink colour”; Chinese sheets made of multicoloured and red fabrics; a Chinese sable fur coat; “two Chinese caps, one of which is of dark-red satin with red silk tassels padded with ruby nankeen, and one of them is covered with sable and the other with black velvet”; “a Chinese sash with a blue band with three silver plaques and two rings”; “two pairs of Chinese shoes of black Chinese satin lined with sky-blue nankeen”; a Chinese towel; “two Chinese salt cellars gilded with painter’s gold”; “four pounds and five *zoltoynyks*’ worth [1 = 1/96 of a pound] of Chinese silver ingots”; “four boxes of Chinese ink”; “a Chinese banner with three silk bands”; “two suede printed pictures with Chinese personages”; “six Chinese paper pictures [made of] paper wicks.” Even Tsvit’s “small gold-plated divine image of Christ the Savior in a silver robe in a wood frame” was covered with “Chinese laquer.” Naturally, Tsvit had teaware galore and even a supply of “thirty pounds of tea in a sack” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 178, spr. 43, ark. 13-18), that is, approximately 12 kilograms.

It would appear that gifts of tea and continuous contact with Russia contributed to the spread of the tea culture. However, it could also be obtained in Ukraine, and the sale of this Eastern product in local shops and at fairs proves that tea-drinking was popular. As noted earlier, already in the first decades of the eighteenth century tea was being shipped abroad from the Cossack Hetmanate. For example, the registry of goods exported in 1715 lists “ten poods of tea” (Dubrovs’kyi 381). A description of Nizhyn in 1766, a work that informs the reader of local fairs, mentions “Great Russian” merchants, who brought tea and coffee to sell (Zozulia and Morozov 16). Coffee and, very likely, tea could be purchased in Hlukhiv. In 1775 Andrii Voitsekhovych, a fellow of the standard, wrote a letter to his son, who was attending the Little Russian Collegium, asking him to purchase and send him the “wines of Islam,” because “coffee is becoming depleted” (Lazarevskii, *Sulimovskii arkhiv* no. 181: 280).

The possibility of acquiring the “modes of pleasure” and indispensable dishware in Kyiv was discussed earlier. In the 1780s tea and coffee were sold at the four markets in Chernihiv, where local merchants sold their wares, alongside merchants from Nizhyn and Kyiv; Old Believers from the free villages of Starodub county; and sometimes even Muscovites. “Teaware” was also among the items sold at the four markets that operated in the county city of Zinkiv, the destination of a considerable number of Russian merchants (*Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie* 303, 671). Russian Old Believers living in the Cossack Hetmanate were also engaged in the tea business, particularly the international aspect of this trade. In 1785 Iukhym Vasyl’iev, a resident of Klyntsi, transported a

variety of goods from his free village, including sixty pounds of tea. Although Old Believers did not necessarily purchase this product in Russia, they could have bought it at fairs in Ukraine, say, in Nizhyn, or obtained it on credit from Russian merchants (Tyshchenko, "Narysy zovnishn'oi torhivli," 348-49). Tea could also be purchased at fairs in Russian administrative areas bordering on Ukrainian ones. In 1779 the Smolensk gubernia office even sent a special request to the General Army Chancellery to inform the population about trading in localities based in its territory, where tea was sold (Shul'ga 160).

It is significant that the habit of drinking tea and coffee also gradually penetrated the lower circles of the black clergy; of course, it would hardly be appropriate to discuss its prevalence among ordinary monks, above all because of the cost of both these products. I was able to locate thirty-five property inventories of monks residing in Kyivan, mostly non-stauropegial, monasteries in the eighteenth century (until the 1780s), mostly in the Vydubychi Monastery, whose archive is well preserved. Of course, the analysis of these selectively chosen sources does not lend itself to conclusive findings, but certain observations can be made nonetheless. Out of thirty-five monks, only two who were rather well off drank both tea and coffee, judging by the list of dishware. Another eleven individuals owned only teaware; at the same time, additional data lead one to suspect that two of them were not ordinary monks but members of the monastic elite. The rest of this group of eleven monks (particularly four who were quite poor) mostly owned individual pieces of dishware, for example, a cup that could be used for a purpose other than its designated one. Moreover, it is not known what they boiled in their kettles because, as Hoshū writes frequently in his treatise, in Russia "ordinary people dry strawberry leaves and use [this] instead of tea" (Khosiu 208). Another four members of the analyzed group of thirty-five monks owned utensils that do not allow scholars to formulate clear-cut statements about their use of the "modes of pleasure" (a can, spice jar, and sugar bowl), as these objects could have been used for other purposes besides tea- and coffee-drinking (see Addendum 2). Therefore, both the inventories of ordinary monks's belongings and the value of the modes of pleasure indicate that the use of coffee beverages remained largely the prerogative of the high-ranking clergy.

Did the culture of drinking tea and coffee spread beyond the walls of monasteries through the mediation of monks? Epifanii, a monk of the Kyivan Cave Monastery, who was detained in late 1772 or early 1773 with contraband Hungarian wine, explained that he was looking after the monastery's inn in Vasylkiv, where, among his duties, he had to ensure the restocking of vodka, wine, "teas, coffees," and other items (Kamanin 4-5). However, thus far I have not been able to uncover the phenomenon of

specialized monastic coffee or tea houses. But they could hardly have been self-sufficient, as they would have needed a special contingent of clients, like, for example, in Nizhyn. There in the mid-1760s, as revealed in Petro Rumiantsev's description of the city, a Greek merchant named Ivan Ternov lived in the castle territory. He arrived in Nizhyn in 1759 from the "Turkish city of Turnov," married a local Greek woman, "and sells boiled coffee." It seems that his business was quite profitable, as Ternov was not engaged in any other trade. He appeared to have access to "ample" capital and had a male servant and two female servants, whom he paid in cash. The Greek also supported his wife and three children, as well as his wife's sister (Zozulia and Morozov 39-40). Over time the number of coffeehouses increased in the city. According to Opanas Shafons'kyi's research, by the 1780s Nizhyn had "6 coffeehouses, where boiled coffee and tea are sold" and "14 houses, where grape wine is sold." In comparison, significantly more establishments sold traditional alcoholic beverages: "There are 110 houses where hot wine is sold" (*Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisaniie* 452, 464, 474-75, 671). It is not difficult to explain the reason behind the functioning of specialized establishments that sold caffeinated beverages. Greeks and Christianized Turks had lived in Nizhyn since olden times (according to the inspection of 1782, there were 765 and 34 members of those nationalities, respectively), as well as Wallachians, Bulgarians, and "Persians" (89 people), who were accustomed to the coffeehouse culture. Moreover, Greeks maintained constant trade relations with Turkey.

Finally, I will note that tea, coffee, and wine do not represent the entire repertoire of the "modes of pleasure" that were accessible to the church elite. Another interesting research subject, for example, is snuff-taking, indicated by snuffboxes that are recorded not infrequently in inventories of property owned by high-ranking monks. Usually, these decorated snuffboxes were fashioned out of inexpensive materials. Thus, it may be conjectured that they were used for their intended purpose, not as a way of accumulating wealth.⁵⁹ The study of the practice of snuff-taking is also interesting given that already by the 1660s and 1670s this custom was interpreted as a sin by Ukrainian church intellectuals. At the end of the century a similar interpretation became entrenched in Russian sermons; here, admittedly, the fascination with tobacco was perceived as a foreign novelty. In the following century the church's "tobacco discourse" entered into an uneven struggle with state economic interests, but no one scrutinized its sinful aspects (Chrissidis 26-43). Stigmatizing snuff-taking

⁵⁹ In eighteenth-century Western Europe porcelain and gold snuffboxes were also regarded as sophisticated and elegant gifts, inasmuch as they were high-fashion items and served as a marker of aristocratic manners (Le Corbeiller 41).

and tobacco smoking, Klymentii Zinoviiv, the monk-poet of the second half of the seventeenth-early eighteenth centuries, wrote about the desecration of the human being by this passion, the dessication of the brain, and the danger of “fierce infirmity,” “disgust and dishonesty” (48). The relevance of this topic in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is also indicated in the marginalia inscribed in copies of Inokentii Gizel’s work *Myr z Bohom choloviku* (*Peace with God for Man*) owned by Ukrainian monasteries; they were made by readers who were very interested in the question of the “permissibility” of tobacco.⁶⁰

Nevertheless, the representatives of Ukrainian high-ranking monasticism (and, it seems, even the rank-and-file clergy⁶¹) were not in the habit of smoking tobacco, having developed a taste for snuff-taking, despite Gizel’s admonition that the use of tobacco “is a considerable, nasty sin against God” (Gizel’ 1: 148) What was behind this—a harmful proclivity or attempt to achieve a certain standard of behaviour, and what broader generalizations stem from this—is the subject of a different study. Here I would simply like to remind the reader that in the eighteenth century snuff-taking became a status symbol of the European elite, an activity that eclipsed tobacco smoking and which was transformed into an important ritual in the life of a sophisticated layperson. During this period it acquired special rules, and the snuffbox began to serve as one of the status-related elements of the culture of the Rococo period. During the eighteenth century snuff-taking also became widespread among Western monks, and, as mentioned in a treatise published in 1700, priests in Spain, despite the ban issued by the Holy See, took snuff while serving Mass and kept open snuffboxes right on the altar (Shyvel’bush 140-53).

⁶⁰ See, e.g., interest in this subject, which was reflected in corresponding marginalia inscribed in copies owned by the Pochaiv, Vydubychi, Kyivan Cave, and St. Nicholas’s monasteries, as well as copies held in clergymen’s private collections (Bondar 341, 343, 345, 348, 363, 364, and elsewhere).

⁶¹ Ukrainian pre-confession questionnaires for priests in the eighteenth century even included special questions about whether priests had taken snuff or smoked a pipe, and whether they were eradicating these habits among their parishioners (Chrissidis 39). It is not difficult to deduce that one of the reasons behind the use of tobacco by parish priests was the openness of their ranks and the strong elective principle, which led to the appearance of former Cossacks, commoners, and burghers in the ranks of parish priests.

ADDENDUM 1

Coffeeware and Teaware Owned by High-Ranking Monks⁶²

Owner and Year of Registration	Education and Career ⁶³	Coffeeware	Teaware
Veniamin (-1735-)	Visited Russia in connection with monastery affairs, steward of St. Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery	-	"a stone teapot with a tin lid," "13 teacups," "7 cup saucers," "small cups" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 169, op. 5, spr. 97, ark. 3-3v)
Ihnatii Kontsevych (†1753)	Alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, lecturer at the Kholmohory Seminary, head of the Kytaiv Monastery at the Kyivan Cave Monastery	"a yellow coffeepot"	"a large copper teapot," "a small copper teapot," "a copper cup," "a small tin teapot" (Zadorozhna et al. 144, 412-13)

⁶² When the designation (for coffee or tea) of accessories, like sugar bowls or cups, is not indicated, these items are included in the same column as other dishware, if a passion for only one beverage is revealed. At times, it is impossible to determine the purpose of a particular dishware item. For example, when the hieromonk Iierofii, head of the Near Caves of the Kyivan Cave Monastery, died, he left behind "a small, damaged cup of Chinese workmanship of Indian walnut." The inventory does not offer any more hints about his passion for tea- or coffee-drinking (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 3-5). Thus, one can only hazard a guess at the use of the above-mentioned wood vessel. Sofronii, hegumen of the Saints Peter and Paul Monastery, also owned "a small, copper *nosatochka*" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 11v). One of the meanings of this term in the Ukrainian language is "teapot" (Hrinchenko 2: 570). However, in another version of the inventory of the abbot's property, the word *nosatochka* is crossed out, and the word *lokhan'* (basin, bowl, or tub) is written above it (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 72), which works against identifying this receptacle as one that would be used for preparing tea. For that reason, I did not include in the table information that does not lend itself to unambiguous interpretation.

⁶³ Only a few indicators are included in this column: place of study, a sojourn in Russia, and the last career achievement.

Addendum 1 continues:

Ioanykii Skabovs'kyi (†1753)	Alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, rector of the Tver Seminary, archimandrite of Russian monasteries and of St. Michael's Golden-Domed Monastery	–	“a silver sugar bowl on four feet with a lid” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 148, spr. 56, ark. 7v)
Syl'vestr Liaskorons'ky (†1754)	Alumnus, lecturer, and rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, senior monk of the Vilnius Monastery, archimandrite of the Kyiv Epiphany Brotherhood Monastery	“a large, brass coffeepot,” “a small, brass coffeepot”	“a copper teapot,” “two small, porcelain teapots,” “seven pairs of porcelain cups,” “five red walnut cups,” “a yellow brass sugar bowl” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 873, ark. 3-4)
Iiesei (†1758)	Vicar of the Vydubychi Monastery	–	“a copper teapot” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 128, ark. 1v)
Melkhisedek Orlovs'kyi (†1764)	Lecturer and prefect of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, hegumen of St. Cyril's Monastery	“an old brass coffeepot” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 159, spr. 114, ark. 18)	–

Addendum 1 continues:

Ilarion (†1766)	Archimandrite who lived “in tranquility” in the Vydubychi Monastery	“a tin coffeepot with a tin handle”	“a red copper kettle for heating water,” “a brass teapot,” “a small, red copper teapot,” “a tin sugar bowl without handles with a tin lid,” “an empty tin spice jar” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 22v-23v.)
Syf Hamaliia (†1767)	Alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, (“senior”) abbot of the Vilnius Monastery (he also spent time in Moscow dealing with matters connected with this monastery), hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery	“two brass coffeepots,” “a wooden mill to grind coffee, on top of it is brass”	“a Chinese porcelain teapot, with a porcelain handle on top,” “a white porcelain teapot with a beautiful picture of trees and houses on both sides,” “three pairs of various types of porcelain cups as well as two tea saucers,” “a tin straining spoon for tea,” “one brass tea caddy,” “one brass sugar bowl,” “one large copper teapot,” “a wooden chest, inside it are two tea caddies and a tin sugar bowl with one internal lock” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 130, op. 1, spr. 200a, ark. 13-15v)

Addendum 1 continues:

Iakiv Voronkovs'kyi (†1774)	Alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, hegumen of the Vydubychi Monastery	"a brass coffeepot"	"a large copper tea kettle for heating water," "a copper teapot," "a brass sugar bowl" with "a silver spoon and <i>prosmენტatalnii/p resmektalnii</i> [unknown] tongs (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 169, spr. 21, ark. 43; TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 538, ark. 9-9v.)
Nykodym Pankratiiev (†1774)	Alumnus, lecturer, and rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy	-	"a pewter teapot with a wooden handle," "a brass sugar bowl," "two pairs of porcelain cups" ("Akty," no. XXIV, 179, 183)
Hieromonk Isaia (-1776-)	Steward of the Vydubychi Monastery		"a copper kettle for heating water," "a small teapot," "a brass teapot," "a tin sugar bowl," two pairs of ordinary cups" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 130, op. 1, spr. 466, ark. 32v, 34-34v.)

Addendum 1 continues:

Kyrylo Kucherovs'kyi (†1783)	Alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (up to poetry), military chaplain, abbot of several Russian monasteries, archimandrite of St. Cyril's Monastery in Kyiv	"one coffeepot and one brass milk pitcher with a lid"	"two black teapots,' one brass," "seven pairs of Saxon teacups," "three pairs of Chinese teacups," "one large cup and saucer of ordinary porcelain," "two pairs of small, ordinary teacups," "a small chest trimmed with marble, two tin vessels for tea, one for sugar" (Zadorozhna et al. 245–46, 440)
Mykolai Tsvit (†1784)	Alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the University of Königsberg, lecturer at Russian seminaries, abbot of the Beijing mission, archimandrite of St. Cyril's Monastery in Kyiv	–	"three tin teapots," "ten colored enamel cups, two of which are green, they come with six identical lids," "two porcelain cups with lids and gold flowers," "two enamel teapots," "one small enamel sugar bowl," "two small, enamel sugar bowls without lids," "nine porcelain cups, one fitting into the other," "a stone teapot with a lid," "a porcelain cup with flowers, in the center of which is a porcelain figurine," "a pair of porcelain cups with a copper enamel saucer," "a pair of enamel cups," "a pair of enamel cups, one of which is broken" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 178, spr. 43, ark. 16, 17-17v)

Addendum 1 continues:

Sofronii Bazylevs'kyi (†1786)	Alumnus of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, cathedral archdeacon and examiner, hegumen of the Saints Peter and Paul Monastery in Kyiv	–	“a black copper teapot, another one of brass” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 180, spr. 12, ark. 11v)
-------------------------------	---	---	--

ADDENDUM 2

Repertoire of Coffeeware and Teaware Owned by Ordinary Monks

Owner	Year of Registration	Coffee Services	Tea Services	Total Value of Property
Hierodeacon Tryfon Datsiievych of St. Sophia's Monastery	1742	-	"a China cup from which tea is drunk," a glass cup	>15 rubles and 5 kopecks, "three minted half-thalers and one <i>chvertka</i> [= 7 grams of silver]," "fourteen <i>tymfy</i> [low-denomination silver coins]," "thirty-two minted <i>shostaks</i> [1 = 6 pennies]" (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1020, spr. 591, ark. 8-10v) ⁶⁴
Hieromonk Nykodym of St. Nicholas's Monastery	1744	-	a spice jar	? ⁶⁵
Iosyf, steward [<i>polatnyi monakh</i>] of the Vydubychi Monastery	1757	-	-	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 128, ark. 4)

⁶⁴ Only cash is listed, without indicating the value of the property.

⁶⁵ He may have belonged to the high-ranking monks, since he took care of the monastery's affairs in the General Court in Hlukhiv (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1024, spr. 395, ark. 3).

Addendum 2 continues:

Unidentified monk of the Vydubychi Monastery	1758	-	-	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 128, ark. 3-3v.)
Hieromonk Ioasaf of the Vydubychi Monastery	1760	-	-	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 1)
Hieromonk Mefodii of the Vydubychi Monastery	1762	-	-	47 rubles and 11 kopecks and “five Polish <i>tymfy</i> ” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 7-8)
Hieromonk Meletii of the Vydubychi Monastery	1762	-	“a small tin teapot,” “four pairs of teacups” (or, “four pairs of cups (<i>finzhaly</i>), “four tin spice jars	>56 rubles (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 13v-14v) ⁶⁶
Iermolai, tax collector [<i>shafar</i>] of St. Nicholas’s Monastery	1763	-	-	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 131, op. 30, spr. 178, ark. 2-3)

⁶⁶ This monk may have held a high rank. His obedientiary duty in the monastery is not known, but it was probably an important one. In January 1762 he was dispatched to the Miklaszewskis’ wardens to pick up the gifts that had been promised to the monastery; he had his own servant and private supplies of alcohol (excluding wine) and fish, all indications of a rather comfortable life (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 11-11v, 14, 16).

Addendum 2 continues:

Hieromonk Meletii of the Kyivan Cave Monastery	1766	-	-	7 rubles and 73.5 kopecks (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 9)
Hieromonk Lavrentii of the Kyivan Cave Monastery	1766	-	-	5 rubles and 43.5 kopecks (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 9v)
Hieromonk Iliodor of the Kyivan Cave Monastery	1766	-	“a tin teapot with a wooden handle,” “an ordinary teacup and saucer”	8 rubles and 94.75 kopecks (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 10-10v)
Hieromonk Antonii of the Kyivan Cave Monastery	1766	-	“an old tin teapot”	1 ruble and 2.5 kopecks (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 11v)
Hieromonk Ievsevii of the Kyivan Cave Monastery	1766	-	“an earthenware teacup,” “a wooden cup”	3 rubles and 67.5 kopecks (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 11v-12)
Hieromonk Onysyfor of the Kyivan Cave Monastery	1766	-	-	2 rubles and 4.5 kopecks (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 12v-13)

Addendum 2 continues:

Syf, a monk of the Kyivan Cave Monastery	1766	–	“an earthenware teapot,” “earthenware saucers and a cup”	2 rubles and 23 kopecks (IR NBUV, f. 160, spr. 245, ark. 13-13v)
Hieromonk Iosyf of the Vydubychi Monastery	1770	–	“a copper teapot,” “three porcelain cups,” “a sugar bowl with three drawers” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 49) ⁶⁷	–
Feodosii, hierodeacon of the Vydubychi Monastery and tax collector [shafar] of Veta	1771	–	“a small tin can made to resemble a spice jar”	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 322, ark. 117v)
Pakhomii, hierodeacon of the Vydubychi Monastery and tax collector [shafar] of Litky	1772	–	–	7 rubles and 25 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 14-15v, 21)

⁶⁷ In addition to this dishware, the inventory also lists the following items, which entries were subsequently crossed out; why or when this was done is not known: “a tin kettle,” a *viktorova* teapot, and two pairs of “clay” [*cherep*] *ianykh* saucers for teacups. Iosyf compiled an inventory of his belongings after his departure to Hlukhiv (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 97, ark. 47). Therefore, it cannot be ruled out that he, too, was not one of the “more abject” monks. Most likely, he was heading for the capital of the Little Russian gubernia in connection with the monastery’s affairs.

Addendum 2 continues:

Rassophore Donat of the Vydubychi Monastery	1772	-	-	utterly penniless ⁶⁸
Rassophore Iov of the Vydubychi Monastery	1772	-	-	utterly penniless ⁶⁹
Hieromonk Havryil of the Vydubychi Monastery	1773	-	-	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 22-22v)
Hieromonk Iosyf of the Vydubychi Monastery	1774	“one tin sugar bowl (with three small compartments), half a <i>chvertka</i> of tea in it, two spoons of roasted coffee, a copper coffeepot”	“one silver mesh, a broken presmenta [<i>presmentalnaia</i> (sic)] spoon,” “2 pairs of porcelain teacups,” “a small copper sieve for straining tea,” “a tea brazier,” “two copper teapots, one large, another, small, one”	20 rubles and 65 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 7-8.) ⁷⁰

⁶⁸ “After his death none of his personal things remained, but owing to his poverty, he was provided with the necessary clothing by the monastery, and was buried in that” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1020, spr. 4228, ark. 26).

⁶⁹ “After his death none of his personal things remained, but owing to his poverty, he was provided with the necessary clothing by the monastery, and was buried in that” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 1020, spr. 4228, ark. 25).

⁷⁰ In fact, the value of the property was significantly higher because the monk also owned a rather varied wardrobe of clothing, fabrics, books, instruments, food, and the like. The indicated sum is only the cash in the form of “a silver coin” that was present in the chamber (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 6-10v).

Addendum 2 continues:

Hieromonk Viktor of the Vydubychi Monastery	1774	–	a tin sugar bowl with a pewter spoon	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 11v.) ⁷¹
Orest, the Litky land steward [<i>horodnychi monakh</i>] of the Vydubychi Monastery	1774–75	“a copper coffeepot” (1774)	“one copper teapot,” “a pair of earthenware cups, a second [pair], of wood” (1774), “2 teapots” (1775)	>131 rubles and 3 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 9v-10, 23v, 24v.) ⁷²
Rassophore Myron of the Vydubychi Monastery	1774	–	–	>15 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 2-3) ⁷³
Hieromonk Iakiv Blonyts'kyi of the Kyiv Epiphany Brotherhood Monastery	1774	-	-	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 169, spr. 37, ark. 10)

⁷¹ The folio with the inventory is damaged, and one entry is completely illegible: “. . . with tin cans” (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 11v).

⁷² In fact, the value of the property was significantly higher because the monk also owned quite a varied wardrobe of clothing, fabrics, books, instruments, food supplies, and the like. The indicated sum is only the cash, in the form of “a silver coin” that was present in the chamber and Orest’s evaluation of part of his stolen property (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 9-10v, 23-24v).

⁷³ It is obvious that he had had “Latin” training because the fifteen books were mostly Latin- and Polish-language ones (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 2v-3).

Addendum 2 continues:

Mytrofan, steward [<i>polatnyi monakh</i>] of the Vydubychi Monastery	1775	–	“a small brass teapot with a pewter lid”	27 rubles and 74 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 2, spr. 553, ark.1)
Hieromonk Iosyf Shaula of the Kyiv Epiphany Brotherhood Monastery	1776	–	–	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 127, op. 171, spr. 35, ark. 7)
Hieromonk Viktor of the Vydubychi Monastery	1779		“a tin sugar bowl”	? (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 33-34)
Monk Aaron of the Vydubychi Monastery	1779	–	–	>27 rubles and 55 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 440, ark. 28-28v)
Hieromonk Stefan of the Vydubychi Monastery	1781		“a small tin teapot”	>28 rubles and 23 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 723, ark. 4v, 6-7.) ⁷⁴

⁷⁴ Only the cash that was present is indicated. In fact, the value of the estate was considerably higher, as the monk was quite well off and even owned a set of carpentry and tailoring tools.

Addendum 2 continues:

Hierodeacon Iona of the Vydubychi Monastery	1782	–	–	3 rubles and 36 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 744, ark. 8) ⁷⁵
Moisei, a monk of the Vydubychi Monastery and “warden” of Bahryn	1782	–	“a small brass teapot with a pewter lid,” “two red copper teapots,” “2 small tea bowls made in Moscow”	>17 rubles and 8 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 744, ark. 2v-3.) ⁷⁶
Hieromonk Spyrydon of the Vydubychi Monastery	1783	–	“ a tin teapot with a lid”	>4 rubles (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 723, ark. 22-22v, 24v) ⁷⁷
Hierodeacon Kasian of the Vydubychi Monastery	1789	–	–	>1 ruble and 29 kopecks (TsDIAK Ukrainy, f. 130, op. 1, spr. 723, ark. 26-26v.) ⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Only ready cash is listed, with no indication of the value of the rather modest estate.

⁷⁶ Only cash is listed, with no indication of the value of the estate.

⁷⁷ Only cash is listed, with no indication of the total value of the estate.

⁷⁸ Only cash is listed, with no indication of the value of the rather modest estate.

Works Cited

- "Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Kievskoi akademii." *Tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II (1762-95 gg.): Kievskii Mitropolit Gavriil Kremenetskii (1770-83 gg.)*, vol. 4, sec. 2, nos. XXIV, XXVI, XLIV, and LIX, Tipografiia I. I. Chokolova [Kyiv], 1907.
- Berlyns'kyi, M. *Istoriia mista Kyieva*. Naukova dumka, 1991.
- Bolotova, H. V. et al., compilers. *Opysy Kyivs'koho namisnytstva 70–80-kh rokiv XVIII st.* Naukova dumka, 1989.
- Bondar, N. P., compiler. "Kataloh vydan': Inokentii Gizel', *Myr z Bohom choloviku.*" *Vybrani tvory u 3-kh tomakh*, by Inokentii Gizel', edited by L. Dovha, vol. 3, Svichado, 2009-11, pp. 337-391.
- Brodell, Fernan (Braudel). *Material'na tsyvilizatsiia, ekonomika i kapitalizm, XV-XVIII st.* Vol. 1: *Struktury povsiakdennosti: Mozhlyve i nemozhlyve*, Osnovy, 1995.
- Chernigovskogo namestnichestva topograficheskoe opisanie s kratkim geograficheskim i istoricheskim opisaniem Malyia Rossii, iz chasti koei onoe namestnichestvo sostavleno, sochinennoe deistvitel'nym statskim sovetnikom i kavalerom Afanasiiem Shafonskim, s chetyr'mia geograficheskimi kartami. *V Chernigove, 1786 goda*. Kyiv, 1851.
- Chmil', L. "Importna keramika z rozkopok staroho Arsenalu v Kyievi." *Novi doslidzhennia pam'iatok kozats'koi doby v Ukraini: Zbirka naukovykh statei*, vol. 18, 2009, pp. 68-72.
- Chrissidis, Nikolaos A. "Sex, Drink, and Drugs: Tobacco in Seventeenth-Century Russia." *Tobacco in Russian History and Culture: From the Seventeenth Century to the Present*, edited by Matthew P. Romaniello and Tricia Starks, Routledge, 2009, pp. 26-43.
- Darnton, R. *Velikoe koshach'e poboishche i drugie epizody iz istorii frantsuzskoi kul'tury*. Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2002.
- Dubrovs'kyi, V. "Do pytannia pro mizhnarodnu torhivliu Ukrainy v pershii chverti XVIII st." *Zapysky istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN*, vol. 26, 1931, pp. 369-388.
- Gizel', Inokentii. *Vybrani tvory: Myr z Bohom choloviku*. Edited and compiled by L. Dovha, vol. 1, bk. 2, Svichado, 2009-11.
- . *Vybrani tvory u 3-kh tomakh*. Edited and compiled by L. Dovha, vol. 2, Svichado, 2009-11.
- Hnatiuk, L. "Chy taka vzhe videns'ka videns'ka kava? (Istoriia sliv v istorii narodiv)." *Novi doslidzhennia pam'iatok kozats'koi doby v Ukraini: Zbirnyk naukovykh statei*, vol. 16, 2007, pp. 386-90.
- Hrinchenko, B. D. *Slovar' ukrains'koi movy*. Vols. 2 and 3, Publisher, 1958-59.
- Iarenenko, M. *Kyivs'ke chernetstvo XVIII st.* Kyievo-Mohylians'ka akademiia, 2007.
- . "'Material'nyi svit' rektora Akademii seredyny XVIII st. (na prykladi arkhimandryta Syl'vestra Liaskorons'koho." *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA*, vol. 35, Kyivs'ka Akademiia, 2004, pp. 20-32.
- . "Nastoiateli kyivs'kykh cholovichykh monasteryiv u XVIII stolitti." *Kovchek: Naukovi zbirnyk z tserkovnoi istorii*, vol 3, 2001, pp. 260-95.
- Kamanin, I. "Plach kievskogo lavrskogo Ieremii kontsa XVIII veka." *ChIONL*, bk. 20, vyp. I, otd. II, 1907, pp. 3-22.

- Kharlampovich, K. (Kharlampovych). *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'*. Vol. 1, 1914.
- Khegel'maier, Khrystof-Vil'hel'm (Christoph Wilhelm Hegelmayer). "Povidomlennia pro stan uchenosti u Kyievi v Rosiis'kii Ukraini." *Kyivs'ka starovyna*, no. 2, 1994, pp. 93-99.
- Khosiu, Katsuragava. *Kratkie vesti o skitaniiah v severnykh vodakh (Khokusa monriaku)*. "Nauka," 1978.
- Konstantinov, V., translator and editor. "Rossiia XVIII veka glazami iapontsev." *Kratkie vesti o skitaniiah v severnykh vodakh (Khokusa monriaku)*. By Katsuragava Khosiu, "Nauka," 1978, pp. 23-39.
- Kozintseva, R. "Ot tamozhennogo tarifa 1724 g. k tarifu 1731 g." *Voprosy genezisa kapitalizma v Rossii: Sbornik statei*, Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1960, pp. 182-216.
- Kuz'muk, O. "Kozats'ke blahocestia." *Viis'ko Zaporoz'ke Nyzove i kyivs'ki cholovichii monastyri v XVII-XVIII st.: Evoliutsiia vzaiemovidnosyn*. "Stylos," 2006.
- Lazarevskii, A., editor. *Dnevnik General'nogo Khoruzhego Nikolaia Khanenka (1727-53 g.)*. Pt. 1, 1884.
- . *Dnevnik General'nogo Podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha (1717-67 gg.)*. Pt. 1 (1717-67 gg.), 1893.
- . *Dnevnik General'nogo Podskarbiia Iakova Markovicha (1717-67 gg.)*. Pt. 2 (1726-29 gg.), vol. 1, 1895.
- . *Sulimovskii arkhiv: Famil'nyia bumagi Sulim, Skorup i Voitsekhovichei, XVII-XVIII v. Nos. 91, 154, 162, and 181*, Kyiv, 1884.
- Le Corbeiller, Claire. *German Porcelain of the Eighteenth Century. The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, vol. 47, no. 4, 1990.
- Lozova, T. "Irynei Fal'kovs'kyi ta ioho 'Razmyshleniia ezhednevnye, pisannye v 1787 godu.'" *Naukovi zapysky: Zbirnyk prats' molodykh vchenykh ta aspirantiv*, vol. 2, 1997, pp. 160-208.
- "Malorusskie domashnie lechebniki XVIII v." *Kievskaiia starina*, no. 1, Addenda, 1890, pp. 1-32.
- . no. 2, Addenda, 1890, pp. 33-48.
- "Materialy Dlia Istorii Pravoslaviia v Zapadnoi Ukraine v XVIII st.; Arkhimandrit Melkisedek Znachko-Iavors'kyi, 1759-1771 g." *Arkhiv IuZR*, vol. 3, no. LXV, pt. 1, Kyiv, 1864.
- Marholina, I. and V. Ul'ianovs'kyi. *Kyivs'ka obytel' Sviatoho Kyryla. Lybid'*, 2005.
- Mordvintsev, V. *Sel'skoe khoziaistvo v monastyrs'kikh votchinakh Levoberezhnoi Ukrainy v XVIII v.* OOO "Mezhdunar. fin. agentstvo," 1998.
- Myshanych, O., editor. *Ukrains'ka literatura XVIII st.* Naukova dumka, 1983.
- Peredriienko, V., editor. *Likars'ki ta hospodars'ki poradnyky XVIII st.* Naukova dumka, 1984.
- "Perepiska s Zaporozh'em (1763-1765 gg.)." *Chteniia v istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora-letopistsa*, nos. 3-4, sec. 3, 1905, pp. 23-49.
- Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii*. Vol. 45 (*Kniga tarifov*), pt. 1 (*Tarif y po evropeiskoi torgovle, otd. pervoe s 1724 po 1775 g. and otd. vtoroe s 1782 po 1822 g.*), St. Petersburg, 1830.
- . Pt. 2 (*Tarif y po aziatskoi torgovle*).

- Potebnia, A. "Malorusskie domashnie lechebniki XVIII v." *Kievskaiia starina*, no. 1, 1890, pp. 91-94.
- Pryshliak, V. "Do pytannia pro mizhrehional'nyi ta mizhderzhavnyi tovaroobmin v ukrains'kykh zemliakh pershoi polovyny XVIII st." *Zapysky NTSh*, vol. 233 (Pratsi istorychno-filosofs'koi sekti), 1997, pp. 47-68.
- Savitskii, A. and I. Savitskii, editors. *Motyzhenskii arkhiv: Akty pereiaslavskogo polka, XVII-XVIII v.* No. 59, Kyiv, 1890.
- Shul'ga, I. "Razvitie torgovli na Levoberezhnoi Ukraine vo vtoroi polovine XVIII v." *Voprosy genezisa kapitalizma v Rossii: Sbornik statei*, Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1960, pp. 157-69.
- Shyvel'bush, V. [Wolfgang Schivelbusch]. *Smaky raiu: Sotsial'na istoriia prianoschiv, zbudnykiv ta durmaniv*. Krytyka, 2007.
- Skorokhodov, L. *Kratkii ocherk istorii russkoi meditsyny. S 20 portretami*. Leningrad, 1926.
- Slovar' Akademii Rossiiskoi*. Pts. 1, 2, 3, and 6, St. Petersburg, 1790-94.
- Subbotin, A. *Chai i chainaia torgovlia v Rossii i drugikh gosudarstvakh: Proizvodstvo, potreblenie, raspredelenie chaia*. St. Petersburg, 1892.
- S[umtsov], N. "K istorii tsen v Malorosii." *Kievskaiia starina*, no. 12, 1883, p. 696-97.
- Sydorenko, O. *Istorychna metrolohiia Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy XVIII st.* Naukova dumka, 1975.
- . "Torhivlia." *Istoriia ukrains'koi kul'tury*, vol. 3 (*Ukrains'ka kul'tura druhoi polovyny XVII-XVIII stolit'*), Naukova dumka, 2003, pp. 1056-86.
- Tyshchenko, M. "Narysy istorii torhivli Livoberezhnoi Ukrainy z Krymom u XVIII st." *Istorychno-heohrafichniy zbirnyk*, vol. 2, 1928, pp. 87-133.
- . "Narysy zovnishn'oi torhivli Starodubshchyny v XVIII v." *Zapysky Istorychno-filolohichnoho viddilu VUAN*, vol. 26, 1931, pp. 315-67.
- Zadorozhna, O., et al., compilers. *Kyievo-Mohylians'ka Akademiia kin[tsia] XVII-poch[atku] XIX st.: Povsiakdenna istoriia. Zb[irnyk] dok[umentiv]*, Vydavnychyi dim "Kyievo-Mohylians'ka akademiia," 2005.
- Zinoviiv, Klymentii. *Virshi: Prypovisti pospolyti*, edited by I. P. Chepiha et al., Naukova dumka, 1971.
- Zozulia, S. and O. Morozov, compilers. "Opys mista Nizhyna 1766 roku (publikatsiia arkhivnoi pam'iatky)." *Nizhyns'ka starovyna: Pam'iatkoznavstvo Pivnichnoho rehionu*, no. 7(10), 2008, pp. 15-200.