

UDC 271.4-523.6(477.82):271.2(470)
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.21.246905

Ella BYSTRYTSKA

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the Department of World History and Religious, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, 2 M. Kryvonos Street, Ternopil, Ukraine, postal code 46027 (elherman@ukr.net)

ORCID: 0000-0002-6844-691X

ResearcherID: AAB-6099-2020

Lesia KOSTIUK

PhD (History), Associate Professor of the Department of World History and Religious, Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University, 2 M. Kryvonos Street, Ternopil, Ukraine, postal code 46027 (kostyuklv@tnpu.edu.ua)

ORCID: 0000-0003-4608-6906

ResearcherID: AAB-4545-2020

Елла БИСТРИЦЬКА

докторка історичних наук, професорка, завідувачка кафедри всесвітньої історії Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка, 2, вул. М. Кривоноса, м. Тернопіль, Україна, індекс 46027 (elherman@ukr.net)

Леся КОСТИУК

кандидатка історичних наук, доцентка, доцентка кафедри всесвітньої історії Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені Володимира Гнатюка, 2, вул. М. Кривоноса, м. Тернопіль, Україна, індекс 46027 (kostyuklv@tnpu.edu.ua)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Bystrytska, E. & Kostiuk, L. (2021). The Procedural Issues of the Pochaiv Monastery Transfer to the Greek Russian Clergy Property in the Second Third of the XIXth Century. *Skhidnoievropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 21, 41–47. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.21.246905

**THE PROCEDURAL ISSUES OF THE POCHAIV MONASTERY TRANSFER
TO THE GREEK RUSSIAN CLERGY PROPERTY IN THE SECOND THIRD
OF THE XIXth CENTURY**

Abstract. *The purpose of the research is to elucidate the mechanism of the Pochayiv Monastery transfer to the structure of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1831, the range of conflict issues between the Russian and Greek Uniate clergy and the government officials' participation in the above-mentioned process. The research methodology is based on the principles of objectivity and systematicity. The following general scientific methods have been used: analysis, synthesis, generalization, induction and deduction, and special methods of historical cognition – historical genetic and comparative in order to solve the set tasks. The methods of classification and critique of sources have been used at the stage of archival material selection. The scientific novelty is that for the first time in Ukrainian historiography numerous unknown archival materials were involved in the scientific use, which made it possible to clarify the circumstances of the transfer of the Pochayiv Monastery to the Russian Orthodox Church. The Conclusions.* According to the

Emperor's Decree, issued in 1831, a set of measures was developed by the Main Department of Spiritual Affairs of Foreign Religions, and orders of the Ministry of Internal Affairs in order to include the Pochayiv Monastery in the Greek Russian Church, which also proved the importance in the government's intention to strengthen the Orthodoxy in the western part of the Empire. The above-mentioned documents laid down diverse measures, which were taken to ensure the transfer of the monastery from the Basilians to the Orthodox. In addition, the government officials participation in the Commission work and the deliberate removal of the Greek Uniates from its membership indicated the political motivation of the act. Ignoring the powers of the Greek Uniates Collegium, the superior treatment of its representatives made it possible to accuse the Basilians of negligent document management and concealment of property. Hence, the procedure for the transfer of the Pochayiv monastery was violated by the current authorities, which clearly outlined the direction of the Tsar's ethnic confessional policy, which was aimed at eliminating opposition denominations in the Russian Empire, including the Greek Uniate Church.

Key words: *the Pochayiv Monastery, the Pochayiv Lavra, the Greek Uniate Church, the Greek Russian Church, Uniates, clergy, the Russian Orthodox Church.*

ПРОЦЕДУРНІ ПИТАННЯ ПЕРЕДАЧІ ПОЧАЇВСЬКОГО МОНАСТИРЯ У ВЛАСНІСТЬ ГРЕКО-РОСІЙСЬКОГО ДУХОВЕНСТВА У ДРУГІЙ ТРЕТИНІ XIX ст.

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* полягає у з'ясуванні механізму передачі Почаївського монастиря у структуру Російської православної церкви у 1831 р., кола конфліктних питань між російським та греко-уніатським духовенством, а також участі у цьому процесі представників державної влади. **Методологія дослідження** базується на дотриманні принципів об'єктивності та системності. Для розв'язання поставлених завдань застосовувалися загальнонаукові методи – аналізу, синтезу, узагальнення, індукції та дедукції, а також спеціальні методи історичного пізнання – історико-генетичний і компаративний. На етапі відбору архівного матеріалу застосовувалися методи класифікації та критики джерел. **Наукова новизна** полягає у залученні до наукового вжитку низки невідомих архівних матеріалів, які уможливили вперше в українській історіографії з'ясування обставин передачі Почаївського монастиря Російській православної церкві. **Висновки.** *Указ імператора від 1831 р. про включення Почаївського монастиря у структуру Греко-російської церкви, комплекс заходів, розроблених Головним управлінням духовних справ іноземних віросповідань, розпорядження Міністерства внутрішніх справ свідчать про його вагоме значення у намірах уряду зміцнити позиції православ'я у західному регіоні імперії. У цих документах обумовлювалася низка заходів, які мали забезпечити безконфліктну передачу монастиря від василіан до православних і його безперервне функціонування. Участь представників державних органів влади у роботі комісії та навмисне усунення з її складу греко-уніатів вказували на політичну мотивацію цього акту. Ігнорування повноважень Греко-уніатська колегії, зверхне ставлення до її представників з боку православних уможливило звинувачення василіан у недбалому веденні обліку та приховуванні майна. Таким чином, порушення процедури передачі Почаївської обителі не лише сприяло поглибленню міжконфесійних протиріч, але й чітко окреслило напрям етноконфесійної політики царату, яка спрямовувалася на ліквідацію в Російській імперії опозиційних православ'ю конфесій, зокрема Греко-уніатської церкви.*

Ключові слова: *Почаївський монастир, Почаївська лавра, Греко-уніатська церква, Греко-російська церква, уніати, духовенство, Російська православна церква.*

The Problem Statement. The institution of the Orthodox Church of Ukraine raised the issue of belonging to the Ukrainian spiritual shrines, among which a prominent place belongs to the Pochayiv Lavra. The jurisdictional variability of the above-mentioned religious center is a proof of the complex political and ethnic confessional transformations that occurred in the history of our people. The formation of the monastery dates back to the times of Kyivan Rus, when its Metropolitanate was subordinated to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Consequently, in 1596 the Union of Brest triggered the Greek Uniate Church establishment

and the monastery became the property of the Basilian Fathers at the beginning of the XVIIIth century. Due to geopolitical processes of the end of the XVIIIth century, which led to the division of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (Rzeczpospolita), as a result of which Right Bank Ukraine became the part of the Russian Empire, hence, in 1831 the Pochayiv Monastery came under the rule of the Greek Russian Church. In the XXth century, as a result of the two World Wars, the Lavra changed jurisdiction twice. It should be mentioned that the jurisdictional palette of the Pochayiv Lavra was determined by a set of socio-political circumstances that had features during each historical period. Therefore, the procedure for the transition of the monastery from one denomination to another differed.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. Modern Ukrainian scholars pay special attention to the study of the role of religion and the Church in the socio-cultural history of Ukraine. The Church religious processes and the place and role of monasteries in them are reflected in the works of O. Buravskiy (Buravskiy, 2016) S. Zhyliuk (Zhyliuk, 2010), V. Klymov (Klymov, 2008), N. Stokolos (Stokolos, 2003), P. Sheretiuk (Sheretiuk, 2012) and other scholars. Moreover, the studies dedicated to the rethinking of the Pochayiv monastery as a religious, educational, cultural, financial and economic center were covered by J. Isaievych (Isaievych, 2002), V. Bochkovska (Bochkovska, 2008), V. Dudar (Dudar, 2008), and Y. Martyniv (Martyniv, 2018). In addition, O. Karlina published the article, which reflected the circumstances of Pochayiv Basilians persecution in the first half of the XIXth century (Karlina, 2012). Some aspects of the integration of the Pochayiv Lavra into the structure of the Russian Orthodox Church, which began in 1831, can be found in the articles written by E. Bystrytska (Bystrytska, 2020), and E. Bystrytska and N. Volik (Bystrytska, Volik, 2021). However, this period requires further comprehensive research. The array of archival materials used in the article is stored in the State Archives of Ternopil region. The authors analyzed a number of cases of Fund 258 “Spiritual Cathedral of the Pochayiv Lavra”, which enabled scientific research of the problem and substantiation of conclusions.

The purpose of the research consists in elucidating the mechanism of the Pochayiv Monastery transfer to the structure of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1831, the range of conflict issues between the Russian and Greek Uniate clergy and the government officials participation in the above-mentioned process.

The Main Material Statement. The Tsar pursued a policy consistently, which was aimed at eliminating the Greek Uniate Church since the incorporation of Right-Bank Ukraine into the Russian state. In addition, the integration of the newly joined territories into the Russian Empire provided for the establishment of the mono-confessional nature of the Moscow Orthodox model in the religious sphere. It should be mentioned that the reign of Nicholas I is the embodiment of the revival of the above-mentioned process, which was characterized by the centralization of government and the use of repressive methods against dissidents.

The imperial authorities received grounds to change the owner of the monastery during the Polish November Uprising of 1830 – 1831, which was supported by some monasteries, including the Pochayiv monastery. In August of 1831, Volyn and Podilskiy interim military governor Vasyl Levashov reported to the Commander-in-Chief of Army 1, Field Marshal Count Fabian Sacken, on the printing of anti-Russian leaflets in the monastery printing house, raising money in order to support the insurgents and direct participation of individual Pochayiv monks in the uprising (Karlina, 2013, p. 70). As a result, D. Bludov, the Minister of Internal Affairs supported Vasyl Levashov’s proposals concerning the Pochayiv Monastery transfer to the Orthodox Church and later on the Emperor was informed of it.

Consequently, in September of 1831 Nicholas I issued a decree ordering the following: “the Basilian Pochayiv Monastery with all the church property, real estate and capital to be transferred to the office of the Orthodox Greek Russian Clergy, using the proceeds to maintain the monastery with its large buildings” (State Archives of Ternopil region, f. 258, d. 3, c. 10, p. 2vols.). In addition, the Emperor also approved numerous proposals of the Main Department of Spiritual Affairs of Foreign Religions concerning the transfer of the monastery. First of all, it was about the eviction of Basilian monks of the Pochayiv Monastery. The Greek Uniate Theological Collegium was instructed to place them in other monasteries before the arrival of the Orthodox. However, it was considered to be decent to leave in the monastery those monks temporarily, who were in charge of the monastery property and economy in order to transfer cases “on legal grounds” to the Greek Russian Church. Hence, they were allowed to conduct liturgies in order to maintain the continuity (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 10, p. 2v., 3).

Therefore, it was ordered to establish surveillance of those monks, who remained in the monastery as the Basilians’ dissatisfaction with the government decisions was foreseen. Thus, the officials tried to prevent the Basilians from taking out the relics of the monastery, temple decorations, icons, which were equally revered by the Greek Uniates and the Orthodox. Although there was a possibility of returning certain church things, priests clothes, church and liturgical books to the former owners, as they were not used by the Orthodox clergy (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 10, p. 3).

It should be pointed out that the document stipulated a separate procedure for the transfer of the Pochayiv Monastery, which included taking into account the movable and immovable property, capital, documents in accordance with the descriptions and inventories. As a result, the transfer was to be attended by representatives of the Greek Uniate and the Orthodox clergy and the officials, who were given a task to keep an eye on the “acceptance of confiscated property” and document the procedure accordingly (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 10, p. 4).

The Emperor confirmed the proposal of the Holy Synod of 1823 to move Volyn Eparchial Bishop with his staff, consistory, seminary, county and parish theological schools to Pochayiv monastery. Moreover, the Emperor outlined the task of maintaining the monastery as a center of pilgrimage for the Greek Uniates, the Roman Catholics, the Orthodox, the believers from abroad and instructed the Holy Synod to ensure the appointment of monks to the Pochayiv Monastery, who by the example of spiritual service could establish the “precarious state of Orthodoxy” in Volyn (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 10, p. 4 v.).

Next government document, which determined the procedure for the transfer of the Pochayiv Monastery “to the Orthodox clergy with all church affiliation, real estate and capital”, was the order, issued on September 23, 1831, by the Board of the Ministry for Internal Affairs of the Russian Empire. Hence, the Greek Uniate Collegium, guided by the above-mentioned document, instructed the Lithuanian Consistory to make the necessary orders to transfer the Pochayiv monastery and move the monks of the monastery to other Basilian monasteries on September 26, 1931 (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 23–23v.).

The Lithuanian Consistory received an order on October 13 of the same year, which appointed its representatives to the Commission for the transfer of the Pochayiv Monastery, which was to begin work on October 16 (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 22). According to the order, Volodymyrskyi Dean Father Abramovych and the Abbot of Kremenets monastery Father Hrynevetskyi as the Greek Uniate Church representatives were supposed to arrive in Pochayiv at the first request and transfer the monastery with all its property to the Greek Russian clergy, as well as the temples of the former Russian Basilian province (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 24). As a result, V. Levashov, the military governor and Volyn Greek Russian Consistory were informed about the appointment of the members of the Commission by the Greek Uniate Collegium (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 24 zv.). However, there was no answer.

In fact, the Commission members, with the exception of the Greek Uniates, arrived at Pochayiv Monastery on October 8, 1831 (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 7, p. 16v.). The Commission included the representatives from the Ministry for Finance ('kolezhskiy' advisor Ivan Vilyashevych), the Holy Synod ('kolezhskiy' assessor Alexei Wojciechowski), the gendarme corps (lieutenant Mikhail Kireyev), the Greek Orthodox Church (a secretary of Volyn Spiritual Consistory, a titular adviser Anton Karashevych). Archimandrite Flavian of Volyn Theological Seminary, Archpriest Narkis Novytskyi, district Protoiereus of Volyn Cathedral, Hryhoriy Rafalskyi, Archpriest of Kremenets (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 7, pp. 16–16v.). Each member of the Commission received a notification from the Chief Prosecutor of the Holy Synod concerning participation in the procedure of receiving the Pochayiv Monastery (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 10, p. 5–8v.). In general, the Commission was instructed to act quickly and not to draw attention to its activities (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 7, p. 16v.).

The Emperor Decree concerning the Pochayiv monastery transfer was announced to the Basilian monks in the dining-room. The rector of Volyn seminary, Archimandrite Flavian, and the locksmith of Volyn Cathedral, Narkis Novytskyi, held the Orthodox service, water consecration, evening liturgy and prayer service on October 10 (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 7, p. 17). The Commission members began to perform their direct functions on October 11 and worked until November 25 (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 10, pp. 26–26v.).

Meanwhile, the Commission approved the property and found out that the financial capital of the monastery, which consisted of: the capital, which was secured by the pledge of estates; the promissory notes and the receipts; the collateral; cash; silver and copper foreign coins, the exchange rate of which is unknown. In addition, the Commission also described and accounted for valuable church products, silver ingots and things, some of which were stored in the monastery treasury (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 10, p. 26v.–27).

It should be mentioned that Father Abramovych and Father Hrynevetskyi received an order from the Lithuanian Consistory to go to Pochayiv to carry out the task entrusted to them only on November 9, 1831, a month after the commission began its work. Upon arrival, they appeared before Bishop Amvrosiy¹ and announced their authority. In fact, the work of the Commission was coming to an end. Most of the property of the Pochayiv monastery was accounted for. As a result, Bishop Amvrosiy then declared that the monastery was already accepted and "it finds no need for the deputies to be appointed by the Lithuanian Consistory" (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 24v.). The bishop sent them to a member of the government Commission, Archimandrite Flavian, who said in a letter that the list of rules approved by the Emperor did not include provisions on the participation in the monastery transfer to the Lithuanian Consistory representatives. In addition, he also stated that the Pochayiv monastery transfer to the Orthodox was completed and the provincial churches were waiting for their turn (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 24v.).

However, the Lithuanian Consistory representatives were not allowed to participate in handing over the provincial churches. Hieromonk Hrynevetskyi arrived in Pochayiv at the request of the Spiritual Council of the Lavra. During the conversation, Bishop Amvrosiy admitted that he intended to involve the hieromonk in the reception of the provincial church, but later changed his decision. Consequently, the Pochayiv monastery property became the property of the Orthodox clergy, without any resistance from the Basilians and the inhabitants of the town. Apparently, the above-mentioned circumstances added to the confidence of the bishop, who stated that he had the confidence of the government in resolving the most important issues, in the case of the provincial church he "trusts himself more" than the numerous members of the Commission (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 25).

¹ Volyn and Zhytomyr Bishop Amvrosiy (Morev) arrived from Annopol in Pochayiv on October 24, 1831.

After the monastery was transferred to the ownership of the Russian Orthodox Church, among the “monastery papers” there was found an income-expenditure book, founded by Bishop Jacob Martusevich in 1819. In addition, the records in it were kept until December of 1830, the expenses and revenues of 1831 were not specified, which aroused the suspicion of the new owners in the deliberate concealment of monastic funds by the Basilians. The suspicions were heightened when certain sums were found in the sacristy of the Cathedral, the cells of cashier Longin Shavurskyi and the head of the candle factory, hieromonk Abramovych, the “monastery treasury”, the printing house, the pharmacy and candle shops. The funds, which were found, were not confirmed by entries in the accounting documents, mostly they were found in hidden places: walls, under the floor, hidden boxes, among old things, etc. (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 47, p. 12).

The Orthodox leadership of the Pochayiv Lavra placed the responsibility for concealing property and accounting books entirely on the Greek Uniate Theological Collegium. Departmental correspondence between the Ministry for the Interior, the Holy Synod, the Greek Uniate Theological Collegium, and the Lithuanian Consistory revealed that the Pochayiv monastery transfer was disrupted severely because the Greek Uniates did not participate in the transfer of the monastery. Instead, the Greek Uniate Theological Collegium made a number of claims pointing at the dishonesty of the Orthodox clergy. Without their knowledge, the Basilian monks were expelled from the monastery. The new owners did not return to the Basilians 36 titles (161 volumes) of liturgical books unsuitable for the Greek Russian clergy. In October of 1833, by order of Pochayiv leadership, the provincial church was appropriated. However, the Board did not receive any documents. In addition, the Orthodox appropriated 489 rub. in silver left by the former secretary of the Ruska province in the provincial treasury (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 25v.).

Meanwhile, the Greek Uniate Theological Collegium rejected strongly the claims of the Orthodox clergy regarding the negligent management of documents and theft of property by the Basilians (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 27v.). In 1837, the Greek Uniate Theological Collegium heralded their point of view concerning the “theft of property by the monks of Pochayiv Monastery” at the meeting of the Holy Synod (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 55, p. 73v.). The leadership of the Collegium believed that such accusations could not cast a shadow over all members of the Greek Uniate Church and once again emphasized the violation of the procedure for the transfer of the Pochayiv monastery to the Orthodox.

The Conclusions. Integration of Right-Bank Ukraine into the Russian Empire involved the spread of the Orthodoxy and the displacement of other denominations in the newly annexed territories. According to the Emperor Decree, a set of measures was developed by the Main Department of Spiritual Affairs of Foreign Religions, and orders of the Ministry for Internal Affairs in order to include Pochayiv Monastery in the Greek Russian Church, which also proved the importance in the government intention to strengthen the Orthodoxy in the western part of the Empire. The above-mentioned documents laid down diverse measures, which were taken to ensure the transfer of the monastery from the Basilians to the Orthodox. In addition, the government officials’ participation in the Commission work and the deliberate removal of the Greek Uniates from its membership indicated the political motivation of the act. Ignoring the powers of the Greek Uniates Collegium, the superior treatment of its representatives made it possible to accuse the Basilians of negligent document management and concealment of property. Hence, the procedure for the transfer of the Pochayiv monastery was violated by the current authorities, which clearly outlined the direction of the Tsar’s ethnic confessional policy, which was aimed at eliminating opposition denominations in the Russian Empire, including the Greek Uniate Church.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to the director and employees of the State Archives of Ternopil region for support and assistance in finding archival materials for the preparation of the article for publishing.

Funding. The authors did not receive any financial assistance for research, preparation and publication of the article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bystrytska, E. V. (2020). Pravoslavne oblashtuvannia Pochaivskoi lavry u druhii tretyni XIX st. [Orthodox Arrangements of the Pochayiv Lavra in the Second Third of the XIXth century]. *Ukrainske relihiieznavstvo – Ukrainian Religious Studies*, 92, 13–41. doi : <https://doi.org/10.32420/2020.92.2149> [in Ukrainian]

Bystrytska, E. & Volik, N. (2021). Integration of the Pochaiv Lavra into the Structure of the Russian Orthodox Church between 1830s and 1860s. *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe*, 41(6). URL: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ree/vol41/iss6/> [in English]

Bochkovska, V. H. (2008). Pochaivskiyi dukhovnyi osередok v istorii ta kulturi ukrainskoho narodu [Pochaiv Spiritual Center in the History and Culture of the Ukrainian People]. *Visnyk Kyivskoho natsionalnoho universytetu im. T. H. Shevchenka. Seriya: ukrainoznavstvo – Bulletin of the Kyiv National University. TG Shevchenko. Series: Ukrainian Studies*, 13, 21–25. [in Ukrainian]

Buravskiy, O. (2016). Konfesiina polityka rosiiskoho samodержavstva na Pravoberezhnii Ukraini ta Bilorusi (kinets XVIII – pochatok XIX st.) [Confessional Policy of the Russian Autocracy in Right Bank Ukraine and Belarus (the end of the XVIIIth – the beginning of the XIXth centuries)]. *Naukovi zapysky Ternopilskoho natsionalnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Volodymyra Hnatiuka. Seriya: Istorii. – Scientific notes of Ternopil National Pedagogical University named after Volodymyr Hnatiuk. Series: History*, 1(2), 13–17. [in Ukrainian]

Derzhavnyi arkhiv Ternopilskoi oblasti [SATR – State Archives of Ternopil region]

Dudar, V. L. (2008). Hromadsko-politychnyi ta kulturnyi vplyv Pochaivskoho monastyria na naselennia Volyni (XIX – pochatok XX st.) [Socio-political and Cultural Influence of the Pochaiv Monastery on the Population of Volyn (the XIXth – the beginning of the XXth centuries)]. (*Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis*). Pereiaslav-Khmelnytskyi, 20 p. [in Ukrainian]

Zhyliuk, S. I. (2010). *Relihiina polityka tsaryzmu na Volyni (1793 – 1917 rr.)*. [Religious Policy of Tsarism in Volhynia (1793 – 1917)]. Ostroh: Vyd-vo NaUOA, 228 p. [in Ukrainian]

Isaievych, Ya. (2002). *Ukrainske knyhovydannia: vytoky, rozvytok, problemy*. [Ukrainian Book Publishing: Origins, Development, Problems]. Lviv: Instytut ukrainoznavstva im. I. Krypiakevycha NAN Ukrainy, 520 p. [in Ukrainian]

Karlina, O. (2013). Represii shchodo vasylian na Volyni pislia Lystopadovoho povstannia 1830 roku ta “styrannia pamiaty” pro nykh [Repressions against the Basilians in Volhynia after the November Uprising of 1830 and “Erasing the Memory” of them]. *Natsionalna ta istorychna pamiat: Zb. nauk. prats. Kyiv: PNVTS “Priorytety”, (6)*, 69–76. [in Ukrainian]

Klymov, V. V. (2008). *Ukrainski pravoslavni monastyri ta chernetstvo: pozysyia v natsionalnii istorii* [Ukrainian Orthodox Monasteries and Monasticism: a position in national history]. Kyiv: Instytut filosofii NAN Ukrainy, 883 p. [in Ukrainian]

Martyniv, Yu. I. (2008). *Pravove stanovyshe ta finansovo-hospodarska diialnist Pochaivskoi lavry u 1831 – 1914 rr.* [Legal Status, Financial and Economic Activity of the Pochayiv Lavra during the period of 1831 – 1914] (*Extended abstract of Candidate's thesis*). Ternopil, 18 p. [in Ukrainian]

Stokolos, N. H. (2003). *Konfesiino-etnichni transformatsii v Ukraini (XIX – persha polovyna XX st.)* [Confessional and Ethnic Transformations in Ukraine (the XIXth – the first half of the XXth century)]. Rivne: RIS KSU-PPF “Lista-M”, 480 p. [in Ukrainian]

Sheretiuk, R. M. (2012). *Hreko-Uniatska Tserkva v konteksti etnokonfesiinnoi polityky Rosiiskoi imperii na Pravoberezhnii Ukraini (kinets XVIII – XIX st.)* [The Greek Uniate Church in the Context of the Ethno-confessional Policy of the Russian Empire on the Right Bank of Ukraine (the End of the XVIIIth – the Beginning of the XIXth centuries)]. Rivne: Volynski oberehy, 432 p.

The article was received January 10, 2021.

Article recommended for publishing 24/11/2021.