

UDC 27-789:342.9(477)«1743/17/80»
DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.11.170700

Yuriy STETSYK

PhD (History), Associate Professor of the Department History of Ukraine, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Lesya Ukrainka Street, 46, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (stetsyk_u_o@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1795-687X>

ResearcherID: E-5136-2018 (<https://publons.com/researcher/1959605/>)

Valerii KOLPAKOV

PhD hab. (Law), Professor, Head of the Department of Administrative and Commercial Law of Zaporizhzhya national university, 66 Zhukovskoho Street, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine, postal code 69002 (t_deputy@ukr.net)

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8580-3261>

ResearcherID: E-7091-2016 (<http://www.researcherid.com/rid/E-7091-2016>)

Юрій СТЕЦИК

кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вулиця Лесі Українки 46, Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (stetsyk_u_o@ukr.net)

Валерій КОЛПАКОВ

доктор юридичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри адміністративного та господарського права Запорізького національного університету, вул. Жуковського, 66, м. Запоріжжя, Україна, індекс 69002 (v.k.kolpakov@gmail.com)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Stetsyk, Yu. & Kolpakov, V. (2019). Administrative Authority of Protohegumens of Svyatopokrovska Province (1743 – 1780): Historical and Legal Aspects. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 11, 56–65. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.11.170700

**ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITY OF PROTOHEGUMENS
OF SVYATOPOKROVSKA PROVINCE (1743 – 1780):
HISTORICAL AND LEGAL ASPECTS**

Summary. *The purpose of the research* – is to determine the main directions of the administrative authority of the protohegumens. *The methodology of the research* is based on the analytical and synthetic criticism of the documentation, which was made by the protohegumens at the Provincial office of Pochayiv Lavra and during the field meetings of the provincial consulate. The comparison of the copies of the encyclical letters, which were included into the entrance books documentation of the local monastic chanceries, has been made in order to establish the impartiality of the presented information on the condition of the original document absence. *The scientific novelty* of the work is the use in the scientific circulation of the entire non-applied corps of the monastic documentation: the visits protocols, the reform decrees, the disciplinary affairs of the monasticism, the encyclical letters of the protohegumen of Svyatopokrovska Province of the Order of Saint Basil the Great. **Conclusions.**

The historical circumstances of the monastic administrative unit formation – Svyatopokrovska Province of the Order of Saint Basil the Great has been revealed. The evolution of the monastic legislation of the united Rus Order of Saint Basil the Great has been traced. The main provisions of the Constitution of the Order of Saint Basil the Great concerning the definition of the administrative work of the protohegumen's institution have been analyzed. The main directions of the protohegumen's activity of the province have been defined: the visitation of the monasteries, the monastic discipline, the appointment of the priests, the convocation of the provincial consuls, creating the provincial archives, writing the messages, making the warnings, the orders, the reformation decrees.

Key words: *hegumen, protohegumen, capitol, order, encyclical letter, decree.*

АДМІНІСТРАТИВНЕ УПРАВЛІННЯ ПРОТОІГУМЕНІВ СВЯТОПОКРОВСЬКОЇ ПРОВІНЦІЇ (1743 – 1780 рр.): ІСТОРИКО-ПРАВОВІ АСПЕКТИ

Анотація. *Мета дослідження – визначити основні напрями адміністративного управління протоігуменів. Методологія дослідження* опирається на аналітичну та синтетичну критику документації, яка продукувалася протоігуменами у провінційній канцелярії Почаївської Лаври та під час проведення виїзних засідань провінційних консулт. Для встановлення об'єктивності подання інформації, за умов відсутності оригіналу документації місцевих монастирських канцелярій. **Наукова новизна** дослідження вбачається у використанні досі не запровадженого до наукового обігу цілого корпусу монастирської документації: протоколів візитацій, реформаційних декретів, дисциплінарних справ чернецтва, листів-обіжників протоігуменів Святопокровської провінції ЧСВВ. **Висновки.** *Розкрито історичні обставини утворення чернечої адміністративної одиниці – Святопокровської провінції ЧСВВ. Простежено еволюцію монастирського законодавства об'єднаного Руського Чину Святого Василя Великого. Проаналізовано основні положення Конституції Чину щодо окреслення адміністративної праці інституту протоігуменату. Визначено основні напрями діяльності протоігуменів провінції: візитування монастирів, дисциплінування чернецтва, призначення настоятелів, скликання провінційних консулт, укладення провінційного архіву, написання повідомлень, застережень, розпоряджень, реформаційних декретів.*

Ключові слова: *ігумен, протоігумен, капітула, управа, лист-обіжник, декрет.*

Problem statement. It becomes a necessity to turn to the historical experience of managing monastic communities under modern conditions of building of Basilian monasteries network. The system of the administrative authority of the Christian ascetic centers has undergone a certain evolution from the complete autonomy (each monastery had its own charter and was independent of each other) to the gradual legal submission first to the local bishops, and subsequently, there was a re-subordination to the newly formed institution of protohegumen. The introduction of this governing institution in the Ruthenian Uniate Church (Latin: *Ecclesia Ruthena unita*; Polish: *Ruski Kościół Unicki*) stimulated the creation of the autonomous system of an administrative control of the Basilian monasticism, which wasn't subordinate to either the local rulers or the Metropolitan of Kyiv, but instead it was subjected to the Papal Law. According to the Papal law (Canon Law), the monastic community of all the provinces of the Basilian Order was subordinate to the Pope. The considered authority system was borrowed from the administrative organization of the Roman Catholic monasteries for a more effective manner of the uniate monastic communities. There is an urgent need to examine the historical and legal aspects of the introduction of governance institutions that continue to operate in the modern Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, in accordance with our times, when there is the authority system reformation, due to the development of church institutions and the development of society, reflected in the regular updating of the Constitutions of the Order of St. Basil the Great (OSBM).

The analysis of sources and recent researches. The main source for the study of the administrative authority of the protohegumen of Svyatopokrovska Province of OSBM is the official correspondence: encyclical letters addressed to the monastic communities. The encyclical letters of protohegumen, both printed and handwritten have remained preserved until our times. The copies of these letters are included in the registration books of the incoming documentation of the monastery chanceries. Due to the fact that the researchers had the possibility to collect and publish the correspondence of the Basilian institutions with the Holy (See: Latin Sancta Sedes, Apostolica Sedes) in a special archaeological publications, the protohegumen's encyclical letters of Svyatopokrovska Province of OSBM still remain unexplored, there is no special catalogue for this type of correspondence, the epistolary material remains scattered and requires the proper systematization (Welykyj, Pidrutchnyj, 1979; Catalogus, 1949).

The author of this article established the main source of the encyclical letters publications of the protohegumen Onufry Bratkowski (1772 – 1775) and Josaphat Morhulets (1777). The epistolary heritage of other prominent administrators of Svyatopokrovska Province of OSBM: Ipatiy Bilinskyi, Sylvester Koblianskyi, Sylvester Malskyi, Atanasiy Sheptytskyi (Atanazy Andrzej Szeptycki), Josaphat Siedlecki needs a further research (Stetsyk, 2016).

According to a number of the researchers, the general information on the administrative work of the protohegumen can be found in general works on the history of the Order, the Basilian law, the monastic authorities and biographical intelligence (Giżycki, 1904; Gil, 2005; Kołbuk, 1998; Lorens, 2014; Narys, 1992; Pidrutchnyi, 2018; Wereda, 2012; Wojnar, 1949; Wojnar, 1954; Wojnar, 1958). However, there are no special generalizations that would thoroughly and exhaustively cover the administrative work of the mentioned protohegumen in the church historiography. Hence, we consider it necessary to study the suggested topic.

The publication is to reveal the main directions of the protohegumen's administrative authority on the basis of the processed encyclical letters of the protohegumen of Svyatopokrovska Province.

Statement of the basic material. In 1743 the protohegumen institution emerged in the Ruthenian Uniate Church (Latin: *Ecclesia Ruthena unita*; Polish: *Ruski Kościół Unicki*) due to the fact of the unification with the two monastic Congregation of the Holy Trinity (the Lithuanian Province) and the Protection of the Blessed Virgin (Rus Province) into one Ruthenian Order of St. Basil the Great (*Ordo Sancti Basili Magni Ruthenorum*). In accordance with the decisions of Dubno General Capitol (May 26 – June 12, 1743), the Pope Benedict XIV issued the decree «*Inter plures*» (Between numerous, May 2, 1744), which approved the unification of the Rus and Lithuanian Uniate monasteries into one Order (Pidrutchnyi, 2018, p. 218).

At the same meeting, the «*General Constitutions*» were adopted, which defined the responsibilities of the newly-elected Order. In particular, it was determined that each monastic province had the right to establish its own council, which consisted of a protohegumen, four counselors and one secretary. These authoritative positions were elective. The elections of the provincial councils were held at provincial capitols (provincial monastic meetings) every four years. The Provincial Capitulum was convened and chaired by the Proto-Archimandrite, who was at the head of the entire Order and all the provincial protohegumen subordinated to him, or by his delegate. The main duty of the protohegumen was to supervise and keep an eye on the monastic discipline in the monasteries. The protohegumen was obliged to visit the provincial monasteries annually, to write reports on the results of its conduct and send

them to the Proto-Archimandrite. During the general capitols, the protohegumen submitted a general report on canonical visits.

In addition, the protohegumen appointed the superiors for the small monasteries with the help of the written consent of the provincial counselors, and for the large monasteries the protohegumen nominated the candidate for the approval to the Proto-Archimandrite (Pidruchnyi, 2018, p. 219).

Let's consider the main directions of the administrative authority of the proto-hegumen of Svyatoprovskya Province.

Visitation of the monasteries. The practice of visiting parishes and monasteries for the newly-joined dioceses (Przemyśl, Lviv-Kamyanets, Lutsk-Ostroh) was introduced by the Zamoisk Synod (1720) and relied on the local bishops. With the formation of a separate monastic administrative unit – Svyatopokrovska Province (1739), which included unicameral monasteries of Przemyśl, Lviv-Kamyanets, Lutsk-Ostroh and a part of the monasteries of the Kholm, Volodymyrsko-Brest, Kyiv dioceses, which moved from the jurisdiction of the local bishops to the subjugation of proto-archimandrite. During the transitional period (1739 – 1743) the monastic provinces (Rus and Lithuanian) were led by two proto-archimandrites that were independent of each other. And only since 1743 the institute of proto-igumenat was instituted for each province, which was subordinated to one common proto-archimandrite (Narys, 1992, p. 204). (Narys, 1992, p. 204).

The records of the descriptions of the monasteries visitations, compiled by the provincials (proto-hegumen), were originally stored in the archives of the Provisional Board of Svyatopokrovska Province of OSBM, which during the period was in Pochayiv Lavra, and their copies were in the offices of the monasteries under study and were actively used for the administrative management of the monastic residences. In particular, during the step-by-step visitation to the monasteries, the commission paid attention to the presence in the monastery archive of the visitation acts for the past years. After all, visitors compared the inventory description for the previous years with the real estate status of the monastery. Particular vigilance was focused on the implementation of the reform decrees, which pointed out the main shortcomings in the management of the monastery and monastic brotherhood.

The visitation agents conducted not only a description of the property status of the monasteries, but also questioned the monks of the monastic brethren to collect the information on the characteristics of the priest and the monks of the monastery. After the division of Rzeczy Pospolita, under the new socio-political conditions, this documentation received a practical application outside the Provincial Executive, becoming a subject of a public law in the Austrian monarchy. In particular, the excerpts from the visitations were used by the prosecutors (those responsible for the conduct of the court cases) of the monasteries during the judicial disputes. However, during the first half of the XIXth century. But the visitation materials came out of use gradually.

The structure of the visitation description corresponded to the requirements of Zamoisk Cathedral in 1720, covering, conventionally, three main sections:

1. The establishment of the jurisdiction and the canonical status of the monastery.
2. The inventory of a movable and immovable property of the monastery.
3. The investigation of the behaviour and the spiritual practices of the monks.

The sections proposed by us cover the small structural parts of the document form: the preamble (the title of the document, the name of the monastery, the organizer and the date of the visitation conclusion), a historical reference and the monastery location, the descriptions

of the monastery's building, the utensils (bowls, disco, spoons, etc.), priestly skirts, plumes, capes, the items of a liturgical use (crosses, banners, bells), the liturgical and library books, the description residence of the monks (cells, kitchen, refectory), the manor (subjects, servants, farmyard, tools, brewery, barns, stables, shpyhlyr, shops, stables), the register financial gains of the monastery (Stetsyk, 2016, p. 14).

However, it should be noted that the reference descriptions of the repression decrees and the characteristics of the activity of monasticism, which, in the context of the analyzed issue, were included into the separate books (APPD, XVIII), were not included in the visitation descriptions. However, during the study we could not find the correspondence of the records for 1763 – 1766, instead, we encounter such type of the documentation from the earliest time (1739 – 1740) (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 1194, p. 1–30).

In the process of the visitation descriptions comparing of the monasteries inhabitants (1743–1780) and the acts of the investigations (1747) it was established that the earlier documents provide rather general and fragmentary messages. Instead, in the later «investigations», as one of the constituent acts of the visitation documentation, the extensive pieces of information provided, which are not limited to the biographical data, but also the descriptions of the behaviour of each monk and abess of the monastery were provided (APPD, XVIII).

The visitations allow to determine the legal status of the monasteries. Among the analyzed monastic cells, it is possible to single out the complete monasteries and their residences (stanytsi). According to its jurisdiction, all the monasteries were subordinate to protohegumen of Svyatopolska Province of OSBM.

Discipline among the monks. Apart from the mentioned protocols, the acts of of the life investigation, the behaviour and the spiritual practices of the monks were the separate group of sources among the visitation documentation of the monasteries. After all, the visitation commission, into which the protohegumen was also included, the provincial advisers and the prosecutor relied not only on the audit but also on the judicial functions. During the protohegumen visitations, the disciplinary cases of monks were considered. The investigative acts contain the ground information for the reconstruction of the monks' biographies (APPD, XVIII).

In order to streamline the monks' life, the numerous orders were issued by the protohegumen Onufriy Bratkovskiy about the observance of the sacrament, the duties by the monks and the punishment for the discipline violation in the monasteries. It was forbidden to waste money and time.

The obituaries of the protohegumen from 1773 to 1774 are mainly devoted to the decisions of the provincial capitulates. First of all, the attention was paid to the implementation of the Charter of the Beresteiska capitulum (1772) and the Hoscha Congress (1766). The attention was also paid to reminding of the need for the hegumens to adhere to the dispositions, concerning the urgent deportation of the monks to other monasteries. Obviously, in order to avoid arbitrariness in wandering by monks from the monastery to the monastery, hegumens are required to give written certificates to the monks indicating the route and the time of their journey. According to the orders of the protohegumen, the monasteries introduced the every Saturday regular readings of the rules and the Constitutions of the Order to inform the monks of these rules. The monks had to conform to the rules and the Constitutions of the Order. The provincial authority also paid attention to the correct interpretation of the rules of the monks' life by local hegumen, strictly prohibiting any changes and additions. At the same time, the problem was raised on the issue of preserving the Eastern rite of liturgies for the elimination

of borrowings from Latin rite. In each of the encyclical letter of the protohegumen Onufry Bratkowski, the greatest attention was paid to the knowledge and keeping to the monks' duties and responsibilities (Stetsyk, 2016, p. 16).

It was vital for the superiors of the monasteries to hand out the so-called letter-routes for the monks, who were travelling, in accordance with the instructions of the provincial council, from one monastery to another in order to fulfill the new duties. It was a virtue out of necessity implemented to strengthen the monasticism discipline. In the second half of the XVIII-th century it was often practiced to change the personnel of the monastery's inhabitants so that they would not get used to a permanent place of residence, but felt themselves as the temporal inhabitants on the Earth and rushed to fulfill their spiritual mission. Due to the monasticism mobility, the excessive attachment to the material things disappeared and the monks were engaged in various activities: pastoral activities, missionary activities, recollection activities, catechetical activities and educational activities. The superiors were supposed to meet the following protohegumen's requirement: to make and send references about the monks to the provincial chancery in order to create a catalogue of monks who were living in Svyatopokrovska Province. The establishment of such kind of annual catalogues, which was launched by Onufry Bratkowski reign, gave the provincial administration the opportunity to trace the dynamics of the monk's movement from one monastery to another. The establishment of catalogues was aimed at controlling the migration processes of monasticism (Stetsyk, 2016, p. 17).

The protohegumen in his letters reminded the monks countless times about the necessity to keep to the monastic vows (chastity, poverty, obedience and living in community). The willful behavior and the «intoxicating drinks» consuming were forbidden. Hence, in the monasteries lives such demeanor should have been eradicated. In case of breaking the rule, at least one of them, Onufry Bratkowski strongly recommended the superiors of the monasteries to impose the penance (punishment) on the monk offenders. The monasteries hegumens were responsible for the eradication of bad habits, especially, to root out the negative behavioral patterns which were brought in by the socialite after entering into monasticism. In particular, the emphasis was put on the paragraphs of reform decrees implementation that were made during the visitation of the monasteries. The monks should have performed the penance as the punishment for the violations of the monastic statutes until they improved their behaviour. Each time when the monk broke the rule, the penance became more severe.

Superior's appointment. The protohegumen had the right to appoint a candidate for the hegumen position, as the protohegumen was in charge of the monks moving. The special delegate was send by the protohegumen in order to nominate the candidate and announce the order for the monastic community, as a result, the appointed priest was introduced to the administrative post (installation procedure).

Before being nominated to the hegumen, the monk occupied various positions and performed various obedience in various monasteries of Svyatopokrovska province. In the biographical notes there were mainly recorded the duties, which the monks received after the completion of the studies and the priest ordinations. Most of them were initially confessors, preachers, procurators, and subsequently were appointed the hegumen of the monasteries and were elected at the provincial capitulum for the position of counselors of a provincial council. In addition to the church duties and the administrative governments, the hieromonks conducted the educational studios, holding the post of novices masters, the vice rector and the prefect of the school, the professor.

It is obvious that the term of the hegumen governance was not clearly regulated, since this position was not elective. Sometimes the hegumen could change every month, or they could not be governed for four years, but several cadences in succession, when it was necessary to bring the matter of the monastery to completion (for example, the construction of a church or a monastery, or the restoration of existing premises, etc.). The tasks and functions of the rector were limited to two main areas of activity: the organization and the coordination of the activities of the monastic community and the spiritual guidance of the monks (Stetsyk, 2015, p. 8).

Convocation of Provincial Consulates (Meetings). The protohegumen did not take individual decisions, but constantly consulted with his counselors and hegumen of the monasteries. He summoned advisory meetings, which were called the consulate, since they were based on the elected consulates (advisers) of the province, who at the same time appointed as the superiors of the monastery, and therefore could not live alongside with the protohegumen and the secretary in a provincial house (at that time it was in Pochayiv Lavra). Proceeding from these circumstances, the protohegumen constantly travelled to various provincial monasteries, conducting their visitation surveys, and upon its completion, summoned a counsel to discuss the revealed drawbacks in the style of an ascetic life.

During one year, several consultation visitations could be held at different monasteries. At these meetings, the current issues of the provincial management were considered: the distribution of foundations and the obligations between the monasteries, the organization of monastic studios, the consideration of the disciplinary cases. Both the orders of the capitula and the instruction of the consul were included in the encyclical letters of the protohegumen of Svyatopokrovska Province (Lorenz, 2014, p. 102).

Compilation of the Provincial archive. During the reign of Onufry Bratkowski the compilation of the Provincial archive was carried on in Pochaiv. That's why, the encyclical letters informed about the necessity to continue the compilation of the inventory descriptions accompanied with the historical references about every single monastery of Svyatopokrovska Province. Moreover, the protohegumen required to compile a detailed register of the real estate finance documentation, in particular, bonds that were used by the administration of the monasteries. This is because this information should have been generalized and sent to Rome, as the Basilian Order was under the Pope's jurisdiction. Furthermore, a detailed description of the monastic landholdings and the privileges, confirmed by the relevant documents, was an urgent requirement of time, since the change of the secular power and the implementation of a religious reform required some protection of rights and freedoms (Stetsyk, 2016c, p. 18).

Issue of Reform Decrees, Notices, Admonitions, Orders. A critical sample was the encyclical letter of Josaphat Morhulets, the protohegumen (Почаїв, 07.02.1777 p.). According to the thematic structure, this letter consists of the preamble and the conclusions and three equivalent parts: a message, an admonition, an order. The first part of the abstract, titled as the «message», the main emphasis is put on the acquaintance of the protohegumen of the monasteries and their inhabitants with the narratives in the monastic statutes approved at the provincial capitol in Univ (1776). The second part of the letter is called the «admonition» section, which provides an overview of the disciplinary issues (the corrector). Various examples of the violations of the monastic statute (rules and constitutions) and the application of different punishment (penance) are given. The third part of the encyclical letter submits the protohegumen's «order», which regulates the most neglected aspects of the ascetic life of the Basilian monasticism. In particular, the emphasis was focused on the restoration of the

practice of a communal reading of the Holy Bible, the rules of St. Basil the Great, life of the saints before the beginning of the monastic meal. Also, the special attention was paid not only to the study, but also to regular, repeated readings for the entire monastic community of the last constitutions of the Order. Obviously, the main emphasis was highlighting the knowledge and the implementation of the revised norms of the Basilian legislation. The attention was paid not only to the violation of the behaviour of the monks, but also to the implementation of the certain spiritual practices (recollections, meditations).

It was required from the monasteries visitors to review the handwritten texts of the preaches and the educational tracts in order to check the professors, missionaries, preachers intellectual abilities. The audit of the students of Basilian schools was also the subject to revision. For this, the chapel chose the examining board, which had to attend provincial educational institutions at the end of each school year to test the knowledge. The commission submitted its work results in reports to the protohegumen. In order to raise the social discipline of monasticism, Pochayiv counsel suggested that monks-offenders should be sent to other monasteries for a spiritual renewal, where there was a more severe way of an ascetic life.

The protohegumen, conducting regular visitations of the monasteries, emphasized the necessity of inventory of movable and immovable property of the monasteries. After all, in the 70-ies of the XVIII-th century in the monastery records there was formed a whole body of the inventory documentation: a book of profits and expenditures; a book of input and output documentation; a register of monasticism; metric books; directory of the library; a register of hired workers. All these registration books were the subject to revision during the visitation of the monastery (Stetsyk, 2017, p. 135).

On the basis of a detailed revision of the monastery, the commission concluded a visitation visit, which was filed for familiarization with the protohegumen of the province. The latter, together with the provincial council (protoconsults, a secretary, an economist), took a collegial decision to eliminate the deficiencies, found in the life of the monastic community. The adopted document was made in the form of a reformation decree, signed by the protohegumen, it was addressed to a specific monastic community.

With the receiving of a decree letter by the monastery office, the local scribe drew it to a special book of the incoming documentation and, with its content, introduced the monks to the monastery who were obliged to obey the promise of obedience (Stetsyk, 2016a, p. 12). In particular, in the Book of Entrance and Output Documents of the Uman Basilian Monastery from 1765 to 1828 (manuscript), the record of 30.06.1781 on the conduct of the visitation examinations of the Uman monastery by the proto-governor of Svyatopokrovska province, Kaniv archimandrite Innokentiy Matkovsky and the secretary of the Provincial Council, Father Orest Nakhimovsky. Unfortunately, the visitation protocol was not included into the book and we could not find it in the well-known source corps. Instead, only the final act of visitation dated back to 02.07.1781, which included the recommendations for improving the organization of the monastic community, was preserved (Stetsyk, 2016 b, p. 24). The informative representativeness of the source is seen primarily in the possibility of the monasticism inner way of life studying: the daily and weekly liturgical cycles, the duties, the behavior during meals, the clausura obedience, the financial and the construction issues. The detailed content of this reformation decree is considered in a separate study

Conclusions. In order to elevate the spiritual level of the Basilian monasticism, the protohegumen established the practice of the encyclical letters writing that were addressed to the superiors of the monasteries of Svyatopokrovska Province. In examined letters, which

were structured according to the points, the main ways of the monk's spiritual improvement and the preservation of the monasteries material maintenance were clearly determined under the conditions of the constant threat of their liquidation and shutdown, both from the side of the Papal and secular authorities. It could be easily noticed that the protohegumen cared about the preservation of the ascetic foundations of the way of life of the monks, judging by the contents of the letters, and, consequently, the protohegumen encouraged the monastery superiors not to be indifferent concerning the abovementioned question.

Among the main areas of the administrative management of the protohegumen of Svyatoprovskia Province, we can distinguish the visitation of the monasteries, the monasticism discipline, the appointment of the superiors of the monasteries, the convening of provincial consuls, the compulsion of the provincial archives, the issue of the messages, the admonitions, the orders, the reorganization decrees.

The protohegumen offered the superiors of the monasteries to send their proposals to the provincial council concerning the issues of the amendments to the Constitution of the Order on the eve of the convening of general capituls. The following fact is the vivid example of the collegiality and democracy in the management of monasteries.

Acknowledgments. We express sincere gratitude to all members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPD, (XVIII). Archiwum Polskiej Prowincji Dominikanów w Krakowie. Zespół Ławra Poczajowska. Sygn. 2. Skrutenia. «Visitation of different monasteries in 1745, 1746, 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750» [in Polish].

Catalogus, (1949). Series procuratorum generalium negotiorum Ecclesiae Ruthenae et Ordinis Basiliani in Urbe. *Catalogus Ordinis Basiliani Sancti Josaphat ineunte anno 1949.* Romae, P. 113. [in Latin].

Derzhavnyi arkhiv Ternopilskoï oblasti [SATR – State Archiwum of Ternopil Region].

Gil, A. (2005). Monastycyzm w diecezji chełmskiej 1596 – 1810. *Chełmska diecezja unicka 1596 – 1810. Dzieje i organizacja.* (pp. 189–250). Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej [in Polish].

Giżycki, I. (1904). Z przeszłości zakonu bazylińskiego. *Przewod. Nauk. i Lit. T. 32.* 65–82 [in Polish].

Kolbuk, W. (1998). *Kościół wschodnie w Rzeczypospolitej około 1772 roku. Struktury administracyjne.* Lublin: KUL, 455 p. [in Polish].

Lorens, B. (2014). *Bazylianie prowincji koronnej w latach 1743 – 1780.* Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, 560 p. [in Polish].

Narys, (1992). Narys istorii Vasyliianskoho Chynu Sviatoho Yosafata [The historical outline of the Basilian Order of St. Josafat]. *Analecta OSBM. Ser. II. Sec. I. Vol. 48.* Romae: PP. Basiliani, 640 p. [in Ukrainian].

Pidruchnyi, P. (2018). Istorychnyi narys zakonodavstva Vasyliianskoho Chynu Sv. Yosafata (1617 – 2018) [The historical outline of the legislation of the Basilian Order of St. Josafat Istorychnyi narys zakonodavstva Vasyliianskoho Chynu Sv. Yosafata (1617 – 2018)]. *Analecta OSBM. Ser. II. Sec. I. Vol. 57.* Romae – Lviv, 392 p. [in Ukrainian].

Stetsyk, Y. (2015). Nastoiateli Dobromylskoho vasyliianskoho monastyria Sv. Onufriia (1739 – 1763 rr.): biohrafichnyi ohliad [Dobromyl St. Onufriy Basilian monastery superiors (1739 – 1763 rr.): biographical outline]. *Naukovyi visnyk Skhidnoievropeiskoho natsionalnoho universytetu imeni Lesi Ukrainky. Serii: Istorychni nauky. 7(308),* 8 – 15. [in Ukrainian].

Stetsyk, Y. (2016 a). *Vizytatsii vasyliianskykh monastyriv Peremysylskoi ieparkhii 1747 – 1767 rr. [The Basilian monasteries visitations of Przemyśl eparchy 1747 – 1767].* Zhovkva: Misioner, 232 p. [in Ukrainian].

Stetsyk, Y. (2016 b). Reformatsiyni dekret protoihumena Inokentii Matkovskoho (yak dzherelo do vyvchennia chernetstva Umanskoho vasylianskoho monastyria [The reformation decree of the protohegumen Inokentiy Matjovskiy (02.07.1781 r.) as the main source of the monasticism studying in Uman Basilian Order monastery]. *Eminak: naukovyi shchokvartalnyk*, 3 (15) (lypen – veresen), 1, 22–27. [in Ukrainian].

Stetsyk, Y. (2016 c). Tsyrukliarni lysty protoihumena Onufriia Bratkovskoho yak dzherelo rehlamentatsii chernechoho zhyttia u monastyriakh Sviatopokrovskoi provintsii [The encyclical letters of Onufry Bratkowski as the main source of the monasticism life reglamentation in the monasteries of Svyatopokrovska Province (1772 – 1775)]. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats DDPU. Seriiia «Istoriia»*. Vyp. 38. Drohobych, 15–28. [in Ukrainian].

Stetsyk, Y. (2017). Lyst-obizhnyk protoihumena Yosyfa Morhultsia do monastyriv Sviatopokrovskoi provintsii [The encyclical letter of Josafat Morhulets addressed to the monasteries of Svyatopokrovska Province (07.02.1777)]. *Problemy humanitarnykh nauk: zbirnyk naukovykh prats DDPU. Seriiia «Istoriia»*. Vyp. 40. Drohobych, 131–144. [in Ukrainian].

Welykyj, A. & Pidrutchnyj, P. (1979). Litterae Basilianorum in Terris Ucrainae et Bielarusjae (1601 – 1760). *Analecta OSBM. Series II. Sectio III. Vol. I – II*. Romae: PP. Basiliani [in Latin].

Wereda, D. (2012). *Bazylianie jako biskupi Cerkwi unickiej w Rzeczypospolitej XVIII w. Dziedzictwo unii brzeskiej*. (pp. 37–58). Lublin – Supraśl: Collegium Suprasliense [in Polish].

Wojnar, M. (1949). De regimine Basilianorum Ruthenorum a metropolita Josepho Velamin Rutskyj instauratorum. *Analecta OSBM. Ser. II. Sec. I. Vol. I*. Romae: PP. Basiliani, 242 p. [in Latin].

Wojnar, M. (1954). De capitulis Basilianorum. *Analecta OSBM. Ser. II. Sec. I. Vol. III*. Romae: PP. Basiliani, 221 p. [in Latin].

Wojnar, M. (1958). De Protoarchimandrita Basilianorum (1617 – 1804). Romae, 298 p. [in Latin].

The article was received on February 17, 2019.

Article recommended for publishing 10/06/2019.