UDC 271.2-523.6(477.41)"1851/1920"
DOI 10.24919/2519-058X.31.306361

Oleksandr CHUCHALIN
PhD (History), Associate Professor of the Department of History of Ukraine, Pavlo Tychyna Uman State Pedagogical University, 28 Sadova Street, Uman, Ukraine, postal code 20301 (aleksandr02.1989@gmail.com)

ORCID: 0000-0003-3876-8237
Researcher ID: D-7654-2019

Олександр ЧУЧАЛІН
кандидат історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України, Уманський державний педагогічний університет імені Павла Тичини, вул. Садова, 28, м. Умань, Україна, індекс 20301 (aleksandr02.1989@gmail.com)

Bibliographic Description of the Article: Chuchalin, O. (2024). Typology and Structure of Monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy During the Synodal Period (the End of the 18th – the Beginning of the 20th Century). *Skhidnoievropeiskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, *31,* 36–49. doi: 10.24919/2519-058X.31.306361

TYPOLOGY AND STRUCTURE OF MONASTERIES OF THE KYIV EPARCHY DURING THE SYNODAL PERIOD (THE END OF THE 18th – THE BEGINNING OF THE 20th CENTURY)

Abstract. The purpose *of the study is to deepen the knowledge of history of Orthodox monasteries of the Kyiv eparchy, to clarify their typology and structure during the synodal period, as well as the conditions that influenced their formation.* ***The research methodology*** *is based on the principles of historicism, objectivity and systematicity. In the article there have been also used general scientific (analysis, synthesis, descriptive, classification), and special historical (historical genetic, problem thematic) research methods.* ***The scientific novelty*** *is determined by the author's statement of the researched issue, its comprehensive study and analysis.* ***The Conclusions.*** *The synodal period of the Russian Orthodox Church is characterized by the structural typology formation of monasteries, which was carried out as a result of changes under social and economic conditions and related reforms of a monastic and church life. The change in the number of Orthodox monasteries of the Kyiv eparchy occurred as a result of closure, reorganization, change of their status, transformation from male to female.*

It has been determined that the monasteries of the Kyiv eparchy during the synodal period can be classified as follows: according to the system of subordination and status (lavra, stauropygial, eparchial), according to the gender of monks (male, female), territorial and geographical factor (urban, rural), system of subordination, maintenance, management and size (full-time, part-time), according to the statute, which regulated the arrangement and way of life of the monastery (communal, non-communal), according to the type of monastic settlements (monasteries, hermitages), according to a functional specialization (hospital, school, work).

Key words: *Kyiv eparchy, synodal period, Orthodox monastery, typology, structure, lavra, hermitage.*

ТИПОЛОГІЯ ТА СТРУКТУРА МОНАСТИРІВ КИЇВСЬКОЇ ЄПАРХІЇ СИНОДАЛЬНОГО ПЕРІОДУ (кінець XVIII – початок XX ст.)

Анотація. Мета дослідження *полягає у поглибленні знань з історії православних монастирів Київської єпархії, з'ясуванні їх типології та структури у синодальний період,*

*а також умов, що впливали на їх формування. **Методологія дослідження** ґрунтується на базових принципах: історизму, об'єктивності та системності. У роботі використано також загальнонаукові (аналіз, синтез, описовий, класифікація) та спеціально-історичні (історико-генетичний, проблемно-тематичний) методи дослідження. **Наукова новизна** визначається авторською постановкою досліджуваної проблеми, комплексним її вивченням і аналізом. Досліджено питання типології та структур монастирів Київської єпархії синодального періоду, які не знайшли відображення у попередніх працях істориків. **Висновки.** Синодальний період Російської православної церкви характеризується формуванням структурної типології монастирів, що здійснювалася у результаті змін суспільно-економічних умов та пов'язаних з ними реформ монастирського й церковного життя. Зміна чисельності православних монастирів Київської єпархії відбувалася внаслідок закриття, реорганізації, зміни їх статусу, перетворення із чоловічих на жіночі.*

Встановлено, що монастирі Київської єпархії синодального періоду можна класифікувати за: системою підпорядкування і статусу (лавра, ставропігійні, єпархіальні); складом ченців (чоловічі, жіночі),; територіально-географічним чинником (міські, сільські); системою підпорядкованості, утримання, управління і розмірами (штатні, заштатні); статутом, що регламентував облаштування і уклад життя обителі (спільножительні, неспільножительні); типом монастирських поселень (монастирі, пустині, скити); функціональною спеціалізацією (лікарняні, училищні, робочі).

***Ключові слова:** Київська єпархія, синодальний період, православний монастир, типологія, структура, лавра, пустинь, скит, чернецтво.*

The Problem Statement. The formation of normal relations between the state and religious organizations is one of the key factors that has a serious impact on a public life. The Kyiv Eparchy of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine has a long history and occupies a special place in its socio-cultural processes. Founded during the baptism of Kyivan Rus, having experienced all the vicissitudes of its glorious and tragic history together with the Ukrainian people, the past of the monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy still has a significant number of issues that require a detailed study. In this connection, the issue of typology and structure of Orthodox monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy during the synodal period is insufficiently studied.

The Review of Recent Researches and Publications. The study of the history of Orthodox monasteries and monasticism of the synodal period began as early as the 19th century. The first researches in this direction were mainly various types of statistical descriptions of the monasteries in the Russian Empire (Ratshyn, 1852; Stroev, 1877). Systematization of information about monasteries led, in the future, to the need to supplement and clarify certain data related to the history of a specific monastery (Zverinskii, 1890 – 1897). Researchers of other direction in the study of this issue analysed the legislation and key directions of the state policy of the time regarding monasteries and monasticism (Zverinskii, 1887; Horchakov, 1868; Kedrov, 1886; Titlinov, 1905; Chystovich, 1868; Ivanovskyi, 1905).

After the reforms of the 1860s and 1870s in the Russian Empire, interest in the issue of monastic income increased (Rostislavov, 1876). Many researchers of this period were impressed by the problems of economic and social history. In particular, the issues of secularization of monastic lands were discussed quite extensively (Zavialov, 1900).

In the Soviet historiography with its atheistic and anti-clerical context, the main issues of the history of monasteries were the following ones: the ownership system formation of monasteries, the secularization policy of the state, the duties of monastery peasants, and social conflicts in monastery estates (Vdovina, 1988).

Since the beginning of the 1990s, the Ukrainian historians have raised the issues on the study of the positive social role of monasticism, the contribution of monasteries to the

development of a public education system, and the charitable and social care activities of Orthodox monasteries (Vecherskii, 2008). The researchers reinterpreted the socio-cultural phenomenon of Orthodox monasteries as a fundamental link of the church organization, their development and economic situation (Lomachynska, 2016).

At the beginning of the 2000s, the regional aspect of studying the issues of Orthodox monasteries also became widespread (Kryzhanovska, 2001; Kilesso, 2002; Lavrinenko, 2005, 2006, 2009). The issue of establishment and socio-economic situation of Orthodox monasteries in the Middle Dnieper region of the 19th century was updated (Horenko, 1992; Pashkovskyi, 2004), as well as the history of some monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy (Kilesso, 1999; Popelnytska, 2005). There was also carried out the analysis of development and state of historiography of researching the history of Orthodox monasteries and monasticism in certain regions (Lastovska, 2013). However, as evidenced by the historiographical analysis, there are practically no comprehensive studies on the history of the Kyiv Eparchy of the synodal period in general, as well as on the scientific issue.

Therefore, the **purpose of the study** is to deepen the knowledge of history of Orthodox monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy, to clarify their typology and structure during the synodal period, as well as the conditions that influenced their formation.

The Research Results. The typological characteristics of the Kyiv Eparchy monasteries presented in this article are quite formal, but at the same time they accurately determine the peculiarities of monasteries, the specifics of their spiritual, socio-cultural and economic functions. Despite the existence of church rules, canons, statutes, which were always decisive for the spiritual life of the monastery, the nature of its construction and architecture, each monastery had its own unique features, traditions and peculiarities of life organization and management.

Before elucidating the issue under research, it is worth dwelling on the justification of the chosen territorial (the Kyiv Eparchy) and chronological (synodal period) boundaries. From the second half of the 18th century the Russian Empire set a course for unification and a final absorption of the Ukrainian lands. In connection with the three divisions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the Russo-Turkish wars, a large part of the territory of the Ukrainian lands became part of the Russian Empire. In particular, on November 10, 1764, a royal decree was issued on the liquidation of the Hetman's power in Ukraine, there was carried out liquidation of the Ukrainian state institutions and their replacement by the Russian ones. As a result of the second partition of Poland (1793), a large part of Right Bank Ukraine (Kyiv region, Bratslav region, Eastern Volyn) came under the rule of the Russian Empire. The subjugation of a large part of the territory of Ukraine by the Russian Empire also affected the situation of the Orthodox Church and its monasteries.

The territorial boundaries of the Kyiv Eparchy were formed already at the end of the 18th century. In connection with significant territorial changes, the issue of redistribution of parishes between the newly created Orthodox Eparchy arose in the empire. In May of 1788, the imperial decree "On Distribution of Eparchy in Accordance with Distribution of Provinces", given to the Holy Synod, suggested that the Eparchy boundaries of the Russian Orthodox Church be correlated with the territorial boundaries of the provinces (Polnoe sobranie zakonov, 1830c, №16658). In the second half of the 80s – the first half of the 90s of the 18th century there were also changes in the administrative and territorial affiliation of a number of poviats. In 1796, Kyiv province was created, the territory of which was entirely located on the right bank of the Dnieper. By decree of September 7, 1797, the

Kyiv Eparchy was ordered to be formed from administrative units on the right bank of the Dnieper, which included 12 poviats. During the following 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries the number of poviats of the Kyiv metropolitan area remained practically unchanged. According to the resolution of the Holy Synod adopted in October of 1799, the names of Eparchy coincided with the names of provinces (Polnoe sobranie zakonov, 1830d, №19156). According to the states of 1799, the Kyiv Eparchy was classified as a diocese of Class 1 (Istoryia rossyiskoi ierarkhyy, 1807).

It is worth noting that the management system of Orthodox monasteries was quite complex in the Russian Empire. In 1721, the patriarchy was abolished. The Imperial Manifesto of Peter I dated January 25, 1721 put into effect the "Regulations or Statutes of Spiritual Collegium" (Polnoe sobranie zakonov, 1830a, №3718). This document actually determined the legal position of the Orthodox Church in the Russian Empire for the next two centuries. It approved the activity of the Spiritual College as the highest body of church power and state department. From February 14, 1721, the clerical collegium was renamed the Holy Ruling Synod, under whose jurisdiction all Orthodox monasteries and their monks were subject (Barsov, 1896, p. 194). This event marked the beginning of a new period in the history of the Orthodox Church, which was called the synodal period and lasted from the 18th century until 1917.

The synodal period of the Russian Orthodox Church is characterized by the formation of a structural typology of monasteries, which was carried out as a result of changes under social and economic conditions and related reforms of a monastic and church life. The secularization policy of the Tsar led to the loss of almost all of their patrimonial estates by the monasteries. According to the system of subordination, maintenance, management and size, the monasteries of the Russian Orthodox Church during the synodal period were divided into several groups. The application of the typology of monasteries allows us to reveal the peculiarities of the social organization of Orthodox monasteries, the importance of each abode, their role and place in society.

Using the territorial principle, the monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy of the synodal period can be classified according to: the system of subordination and status (lavra, stauropygial, eparchial), the gender composition of monks (male, female), territorial and geographical factors (urban, rural), the system of subordination, maintenance, management and sizes (full-time, part-time, prescribed), the statute that regulated the arrangement and way of life of the abode (shared, non-shared), the type of monastic settlements (monasteries, hermitages), a functional specialization (hospital, school, work).

The conflict between the state and the Orthodox Church since the end of the 15th century, in the second half of the 18th century ended with the victory of a secular power. On February 26, 1764, the Russian Empress Catherine II signed a manifesto on the secularization of a spiritual land ownership (Polnoe sobranie zakonov, 1830b, №12060). According to this document, land and peasants, which belonged to the state treasury and were transferred to the management of the Economy Collegium, were confiscated from the Orthodox Church in favour of the state. In 1786, its influence spread to the territory of Left Bank Ukraine, and in 1795 to Right Bank Ukraine. As evidenced by statistical data, implementation of this manifesto dealt a heavy and irreparable blow to the Orthodox monasteries and monasticism. For example, as of the beginning of 1762, there were 954 monasteries and 11,153 monks in the Russian Empire. As a result of the secularization reform, 418 monasteries were completely liquidated by the Holy Synod, 226 monasteries acquired the state status and were transferred

to state funding. For their maintenance, the state assigned annual monetary payments in accordance with their economic status, significance of the monastery. The remaining 310 monasteries were excluded from the state status and could continue their existence at the expense of voluntary donations and self-sufficiency (Chupys, 2013, p. 36).

The Holy Synod determined the staff, i.e. the number of monks in monasteries. According to the system of subordination, management and size, abodes of the Russian Orthodox Church were divided into several groups. During the synodal period, in the Russian Empire the largest spiritual centres and monasteries, included into the state status, became the lavras, which enjoyed a special patronage of the monarchs. The number of monks in their staff could be up to 101 people. All other monasteries were eparchial and were divided into three classes. This made it possible for monasteries to receive payments from the state treasury for distribution to monks and maintenance of monastery servants. The allowed number of full-time monks and nuns was determined by belonging to one or another class. The number of monks in monasteries of Class 1 could be up to 33 people, Class 2 – up to 17, Class 3 – up to 12 people. The structure of monasteries of the Russian Orthodox Church remained unchanged almost until the end of the synodal period. The following annual salaries were determined for regular monasteries: lavras – 10,070 rubles each, men's monasteries of Class 1 – 2,017.5 rubles each, Class 2 – 1,311.9 rubles, Class 3 – 806 .3 rub.; for women – Class 1 – 2,009 rubles, Class 2 – 475.8 rubles, Class 3 – 375.6 rubles (Fedorov, 2003, 212). In monasteries of the first and second class, abbots had the rank of archimandrite with a salary of 550 and 300 rubles, respectively, and in monasteries of Class 3 – abbots – with a salary of 150 rubles (Kuznets, 2021, 10). The abbesses of women's monasteries had the rank of an abbess. In the monasteries of Class 1, their salary was 100 rubles, in Class 2 – 60 rubles, and Class 3 – 40 rubles (Barsov, 1885, p. 292).

By Decree of March 31, 1764, which were excluded from the state status were also divided into three classes depending on the number of monks. These monasteries were supported by donations, as well as income from the lands of the monastery (Polnoe sobranie zakonov, 1830b, №12121). However, the period of the Great Reforms of the 1860s and 1870s in the Russian Empire also brought changes to the organization of a monastic life. By Decree on the State Council of December 27, 1867, the division of dioceses into classes was abolished, instead new staff and salaries were introduced. Thus, in the Kyiv Eparchy, the Metropolitan's salary was 4,000 rubles, 5,000 rubles were allocated for the payment of the retinue of the bishop (economist, priest, cross hieromonks, sacristan), and 175 rubles for the repair of the bishop's house (Barsov, 1885, p. 288).

The existence of monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy during the synodal period was not stable. Their fate was determined by the realities of a contemporary religious policy of the Russian Empire, which was characterized by periods of ups and downs in a monastery construction. As of 1764, there were 2 stauropygial and 38 eparchial monasteries on the territory of the Kyiv Eparchy (Pokrovskyi, 1913, p. 925), of which two monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy had the status of stauropygial. This status was assigned to the Orthodox monasteries, which made them independent of local Eparchy authorities. The stauropygial monasteries were subordinated directly to the Patriarch of Moscow or the Holy Synod directly. The remaining 38 monasteries were eparchial, which implied their subordination to the eparchial bishop.

Table 1

Monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy in 1764[1]

N	Men's monasteries	N	Women's monasteries
			Eparchy monasteries
Stavropygian monasteries		1.	Kyiv-Voznesenskyi Fedorovskyi
1.	Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra	2.	Kyiv-Bohoslovskyi
2.	Kyiv-Mezhihirskyi	3.	Kyiv-Iordanskyi
Eparchy monasteries		4.	Kozeletskyi Bohoslovskyi
1.	Kafedralnyi Sofiiskyi	5.	Nizhynskyi Vvedenskyi
2.	Pustynno-Mykolaivskyi	6.	Novomyiskyi Uspenskyi
3.	Zolotoverkhyi-Mykhailivskyi	7.	Pustynnomutynskyi
4.	Bratskyi Uchylyshchnyi	8.	Hlukhovskyi Uspenskyi
5.	Vydubytskyi Mykhailivskyi	9.	Vladynskyi Pokrovskyi
6.	Kyrylivskyi Mykhailivskyi	10.	Velykobudytskyi Preobrazhenskyi
7.	Petropavlivskyi Podolskyi	11.	Pushkarovskyi Pokrovskyi
8.	Hretskyi Podolskyi	12.	Bostrytskyi Voznesenskyi
9.	Kozelskyi Heorhiivskyi	13.	Piatnytskyi Chernihivskyi
10.	Nizhynskyi Blahovishchenskyi	14.	Pokrovskyi Mokoshynskyi
11.	Maksakovskyi Preobrazhenskyi	15.	Uspenskyi Pechenytskyi
12.	Baturynskyi Mykolaivskyi	16.	Pokrovskyi Shumorskyi
13.	Hamaliivskyi Kharlampiivskyi	17.	Bohoslovskyi Myronivskyi
14.	Hlukhivskyi Petropavlivskyi		
15.	Mharskyi Lubenskyi		
16.	Hustynskyi Troitskyi		
17.	Sorochynskyi Mykhailivskyi		
18.	Neforashchanskyi Uspenskyi		
19.	Poltavskyi Khrestovozdvyzhenskyi		
20.	Pustynnomelekskyi Preobrazhenskyi		
21.	Krasnohorskyi Hodiatskyi		

During the synodal period, in the Russian Empire, among the 4 existing lavras the leading place was occupied by the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, which at the time belonged to monasteries of Class 1 (Barsov, 1885, p. 285). It was one of the first men's monasteries, founded in the 11th century, back in the days of Kyivan Rus. The monastery received the status of a lavra in 1688[2] The self-government of the Kyiv-Pechersk Monastery was recognized by the certificate of the Moscow Patriarch Ioakim. The internal affairs of the Lavra were decided by its abbot, who held the rank of Archimandrite, together with the Spiritual Council and were formalized by the appropriate protocol (Barsov, 1885, p. 286).

From April 10, 1786, the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra was subordinated to the Metropolitan of Kyiv (Stroev, 1877, p. 14), who became its sacred archimandrite (abbot). From that time and during the

[1] Pokrovskyi, Y.M. (1913). Russkye eparkhyiy v XVI–XIX vv., ikh otkrytie, sostav i predely. Opyt tserkovno-istorycheskogo, statistycheskogo i geograficheskogo issledovanyia [Russian dioceses in the 16th – 19th centuries, their discovery, composition and borders. Experience in church historical, statistical and geographical research]. Kazan: Tsentralnaia tipografia, 1913. Tom vtoroi (XVIII vek). P. 925.

[2] Lavra (Greek – lane, cave) is the currently established official name of the most influential Orthodox and unofficial name of some Greek-Catholic men's monasteries. Orthodox lavras are headed by abbots in rank no lower than an archimandrite.

synodal period, the people who took the position of the metropolitan of Kyiv and Halytskyi were at the same time abbots of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra. In the Lavra the first person after the abbot was the vicar, usually a hieromonk or abbot. Later he became known as Archimandrite. All affairs of the monastery were managed by the Spiritual Council headed by the vicar.

Hermitages ('pustyn') were a special type of monastic cohabitation. The Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra also had two hermitages[3] – Holosiyivska and Kytayivska. These hermitages arose on the basis of previously created hermitages ('skyt')[4]. The Holosiyiv Hermitage is considered to have been founded in 1621, when the archimandrite of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, and later Metropolitan of Kyiv Petro Mohyla, built a church on the site of the hermitage. Since 1793, this territory had been attributed to the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, and from the second half of the 19th century the Holosiyiv Hermitage became the summer residence of the Metropolitans of Kyiv (Denisov, 1908, p. 307).

The history of the Kytayivska Hermitage began in 1716. Very soon it turned into a place of mass pilgrimage. Since 1786, the Kytayivska Hermitage had been secured by monastic states under the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra. By the end of the 19th century the architectural ensemble of its monastery yard was formed, which included several churches, a 45-meter-high bell tower, a refectory, the abbot's house, buildings for the monks to live in, and a two-story shelter for old and infirm monks. From the end of the 19th century the Lavra candle factory also operated there (Denisov, 1908, p. 307). All other monasteries that were within the boundaries of the Kyiv Eparchy were subordinate to the Metropolitan of Kyiv and Halytskyi and had the status of diocesan ones. Their superiors were appointed by the Kyiv Eparchy bishop and approved by the Holy Synod.

From April 10, 1786, the Kyiv Eparchy also fell under the secularization of monastic possessions (Polnoe sobranie zakonov, 1830c, №16375). Secularization dealt a blow to the monasteries of the diocese as well as spiritual and architectural historical monuments. As a result of secularization, the number of the Kyiv Eparchy monasteries decreased significantly. In 1787, two men's monasteries of Class 1 were among the first ones in the Kyiv eparchy to be closed – the Kyiv Bratsky Epiphany and the Mezhyhirsky Preobrazhensky Spasky (Zverinskii, 1890 – 1897, p. 150). The spiritual academy of the Kyiv Bratsky Monastery with all its institutions was ordered to be transferred to the bishop's house and the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, and the monastery was reorganized into the main military hospital. The Stavropigial Kyiv-Mezhyhirsky monastery was ordered to be transferred to the Tavria province with the status of Class 1 monastery. The premises and property of this monastery were transferred to the balance of the department of the Order of Public Care. Over time, a faience factory was located on the territory of the monastery (Zverinskii, 1890 – 1897, p. 181). The Kyiv Spaso-Sofia Men's Cathedral Monastery was ordered to be repurposed into the Kyiv Sophia Cathedral with the establishment of the main national school in Kyiv (Zverinskii, 1890 – 1897, p. 234).

The women's convents of the Kyiv Eparchy were not left behind by secularization. Thus, for example, the Theological Mykhailivskyi Convent, founded in 1621 by Metropolitan Iov

[3] Pustyn is a special type of Orthodox men's monastery, established in a sparsely populated desert ('pustynne') place, away from people. Pustyn, as a rule, arose on the basis of skites (hermitage).

[4] A hermitage is a small settlement of hermit monks at a distance from the monastery to which they were subordinated. Hermitages were usually closed to outside visitors.

Boretsky of Kyiv, in 1786 was included in Class 2 monasteries, and in 1789 it was transferred to the neighbouring Poltava province. The state policy of the Russian Empire implemented in this way led to a rapid decrease in the number of monasteries in the Kyiv Eparchy. As of the beginning of the 19th century there were only 19 monasteries (Zverinskii, 1890 – 1897, pp. 94–95). Later, during the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th centuries the total number of monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy did not change.

The Kyiv eparchial monasteries also had hermitages in their structure. Thus, in 1861, near the city of Kyiv, in the Feofania tract, a men's hermitage belonging to the Kyiv-Mikhaylivsky Zolotoverkhy Monastery arose. Over time, the Feofania hermitage turned into a powerful monastery complex with three churches, bishop's rooms, a cemetery for the monks of the Kyiv-Mikhailivsky monastery, hotels for pilgrims. To ensure economic needs, the monastery owned 143 acres of land. Also, the Bohorodytsky Hermitage, which arose in 1900 on the site of the ancient cave monastery of Hlynetsk, belonged to the Kyiv Bratsky Monastery. On the territory of the hermitage, a temple and a house for the accommodation of pilgrims were built (Denisov, 1908, pp. 308–309).

In addition, all diocesan monasteries were divided into full-time and part-time. As mentioned above, this division of monasteries was introduced in the 18th century. Full-time monasteries received help from the state, independent ones existed entirely at the expense of their own income. State monasteries, in turn, were divided into three classes. The difference between them was the amount of funds received and the prestige of the monastery. In the 19th century the class of a monastery indicated its nobility, as some monasteries reached the salaries of special estates, while the others were placed a class above without additional salary. Thus, at the end of the 19th century, in the Kyiv eparchy there were 21 monasteries – 17 for men and 4 for women. Of them, 9 men's and 1 women's monasteries were full-time (Denisov, 1908, pp. 288–310).

All Orthodox monasteries could be communal or non-communal. A feature of cohabiting monasteries was that, at the order of the abbot, they provided the monks with everything they needed. Accordingly, the results of the monks' work in such monasteries were common. The income received from the activity of the monastery and the monks was the property of the monastery and the monks. In full-time communal monasteries, funds allocated from the state treasury went to the treasury of the monastery and were used for the common needs of the abode (Razieiasnitelnye postanovleniia, 1899, p. 65).

A number of objective and subjective circumstances sometimes hindered a proper development of communal monasteries. Abbots from other monasteries were often sent to such monasteries. Sometimes these were people who had recently become monks, who had no experience of monastic life at all, did not understand the peculiarities of the organization of communal monasteries, and were not familiar with the peculiarities and rules of life in a particular monastery. It was difficult for such newly appointed abbots to get along with the local monks and maintain order in the monastery.

There were also frequent cases of actual "usurpation" of power by abbots in monasteries, complete concentration of management in their hands. Such monastic authoritarianism had a negative impact on the internal climate in the monastery, prevented the formation of a

circle of people who would participate in decision-making, help organize the activities of the monastery and be a substitute for the abbot in case of his illness or death. These negative trends only intensified over time and prompted the management of the dioceses to raise the issue before the Holy Governing Synod about the legal settlement of the specified problem.

In order to further prevent such cases in the future, the Synod issued a decree dated March 20, 1862 regarding the procedure for electing abbots and abbesses of communal Orthodox monasteries (Razieiasnitelnye postanovleniia, 1899, p. 82), which extended to both men's and women's monasteries. According to this document, the abbots or abbesses of cohabiting monasteries were elected mainly from among the brothers of the same monastery or from another but the same cohabiting monastery. The procedure for the election of the abbot of the monastery was carried out in the presence of the deacon of the monasteries or a representative of the higher diocesan administration. In the absence of the consent of the majority of the members of the brotherhood during open voting, the document provided for a secret voting procedure. Information about the chosen candidate for the position of abbot of the monastery was submitted for review and approval by the Holy Synod.

To manage the monastery, the abbot was allowed to have an assistant who helped him in organizing the life of the monastery, preserving its property, and temporarily performed the duties of the abbot in the latter's absence. It became the duty of each head and brother of the monastery to comply with the statute already existing in the monastery, and in the absence of such, to develop together with monks and document the rules and customs of their monastery. Such rules were to be drawn up in a relevant document and submitted to the head of the diocese for approval.

Non-communal monasteries had a somewhat different internal organization and property status. For monks brothers in a non-communal monastery, shared meals were organized at the expense of the monastery. Monks provided themselves with clothes and other necessary things.

Researchers of the history of Orthodox monasteries use the principle of functional specialization as a classification principle for monasteries during the synodal period. Based on the data available in the second half of the 19th century conditions, monasteries began to be divided into multi-functional and mono-functional (hospital, school, work).

Practically all monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy of the synodal period were multifunctional. However, a certain differentiation is observed among the monasteries, caused by the needs of the contemporary society. The category of hospital monasteries includes the Mykilsky (Trinity) Hospital and Holy Trinity Kyrylivskyi men's monasteries, as well as the Kyiv-Pokrovsky women's monastery. Thus, during the period under research, the Mykilsky Hospital Monastery existed on the territory of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra. The development of Ukrainian monastic medicine and the founding of one of the first hospitals on the territory of Kyivan Rus are connected with it. In the 19th century certain steps were made in an effort to integrate ancient Ukrainian medicine with official practical and scientific medicine. Thus, since 1822, the position of doctor appeared in the staff of this monastery, and the Spiritual Cathedral of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra was offered to organize a medical school and start training relevant specialists. The Lavra pharmacy was founded there, which quickly became famous and popular in the entire Kyiv region, and in 1846, a two-story hospital for the poor

with 32 beds was built. In 1913, an almshouse for retired bishops and elders from the Lavra brotherhood was also established at the monastery (Dzeman, 2015, p. 68).

After the Kyrylivskyi Monastery in Kyiv was closed in 1786, its premises were used as a shelter for the disabled. Later, "the Kyrylivsky God-pleasing institutions" were formed around the former monastery territory, which were under the authority of the Kyiv provincial government. Numerous hospital buildings began to be constructed there. Since 1806, a hospital for mentally ill people was established. Kyrylivska Church remained a hospital church, and a pharmacy was placed in the belfry.

In 1889, on the initiative and at the expense of the native aunt of the Russian Emperor Nicholas II, the hospital Kyiv-Pokrovsky Monastery was established in the city of Kyiv. A 40-bed hospital with free dispensing of medicines, as well as a shelter for the blind and terminally ill, was located there. A parochial school with a dormitory for students was also built at the monastery (Rasporiazheniia, 1902b, p. 4).

In addition, school monasteries existed on the territory of the Kyiv Eparchy of the synodal period. The Kyiv-Bratsky Monastery was among them. In 1632, the Kyiv-Mohyla collegium was established at the monastery, which over time received the status of an academy (Denisov, 1908, 297). From the end of the 18th century in Chyhyrynsky district of Kyiv province, there was the Lebedynsky Mykolayivsky Convent. In 1858, a women's school for orphans of the clergy was established at the monastery. Through the efforts of the superiors, this educational institution was reorganized into a two-class women's vocational school, in which 150 girls studied (Denisov, 1908, p. 307).

From the second half of the 19th century socio-cultural activity became the main activity in Orthodox women's monasteries and was much wider than in men's monasteries. The establishment of educational and charitable complexes, which usually consisted of schools, asylums, almshouses, and hospitals, was a characteristic feature of women's monasteries. Monasteries took on the role of social stabilizers, taking care and education of vulnerable sections of society. In fact, the state and the church used a hidden resource, using the growth of self-awareness and a social activity of women during the post-reform period for the development of a network of social institutions. Thus, by the decree of the Holy Synod of April 25, 1866, the state obliged the creation of new monasteries to open educational institutions. Since December 1868, the relevant decree had already provided for the arrangement of educational institutions for girls of the spiritual rank at women's monasteries, and from 1870 – maintenance and development of almshouses, schools, hospitals and other social institutions existing at women's monasteries (Kalashnikov, 1896, p. 147). An example can be given of the opening of women's monasteries on the territory of the Kyiv Eparchy, provided that they organize a system of institutions of a social direction. This direction was typical of women's monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy in the second half of the 19th century.

The type of working monastery finally developed at the end of the 19th century. The term "working monastery" arose shortly after the reforms of the 1860s, when learned, educated monasticism began to disappear, and the monastery cells were filled with peasants freed from serfdom. Monasteries acquired the features of agricultural artillery quickly. On the territory of the Kyiv eparchy, monasteries, which were mainly located on the periphery, became such a kind of artillery.

Table 2

Monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy at the beginning of the 20th century[5]

N	The name of the monastery	The status of the monastery	
		– class of the monastery	– way of life of monks
Kyiv city			
	Men's monasteries		
1.	Kyiv-Pechersk lavra (with the hermitage: Holosiivska, Kytaievska ta Preobrazhenska)	lavra	not cohabitation
2.	Kyiv-Mykhailivskyi Zolotoverkhyi (with the assigned monastery of Feofania)	1st class	not cohabitation
	- Feofanivskyi Sviato-Panteleimonivskyi (St. Panteleimon)	2 class	cohabitation
	- Mykilskyi Troitskyi (Trinity)	hospital	
3.	Kyiv-Bratskyi Bohoiavlenskyi (with the ascribed hermitage "Tserkovshchyna", where the Prechystyi, Hnyletskyi, Hlushenskyi i Bohorodytskyi hermitages are located)	1st class, school	not cohabitation
	– Prechysta hermitage in "Tserkovshchyna"		cohabitation
	– St. Heorhiivskyi hermitage near Uman		cohabitation
4.	Kyiv Pustynno-Mykolaivskyi	1st class	not cohabitation
5.	Kyiv-Vydubytskyi Mykhailivskyi (with the ascribed hermitage "Kruhlyk")	1st class	not cohabitation
6.	Kyiv Sviato-Troitskyi (Holy Trinity)	1st class	cohabitation
7.	Kyiv-Hretskyi Katerynenskyi Synaiskyi	2 class	cohabitation
Women's monasteries			
8.	Kyiv-Florivskyi Voznesenskyi	1st class	not cohabitation
9.	Kyiv-Pokrovskyi (with the associated Mezhyhirsky monastery)	1st class	cohabitation
10.	Kyiv-Vvedenskyi		cohabitation
County monasteries			
11.	Rzhyshchivskyi Preobrazhenskyi (Rzhyshchiv, Transfiguration of the Lord)	women's, 2 class	cohabitation
12.	Korsunskyi Onufriivskyi (Korsun, St. Onufriy)	women's	cohabitation
13.	Motronynskyi Sviato-Troitskyi (Motrona`s Holy Trinity)	women's	cohabitation

[5] The table was created by the author based on materials from the funds of the monasteries of the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv and the book "Pravoslavnye monastyri Rossyiskoi imperiy. Polnyi spisok vsekh 1105 nyne sushchestvuiushchykh v 75 hubernyiakh y oblastiakh Rossiy (i 2 inostrannykh hosudarstvakh) muzhskikh i zhenskikh monastyrei, arkhiereiskikh domov i zhenskikh obshchyn" [Orthodox monasteries of the Russian Empire. The full list of all 1,105 male and female monasteries, bishop's houses and women's communities currently existing in 75 provinces and regions of Russia (and 2 foreign countries)] / comp. L. I. Denisov. Moskva, 1908. XII, 984 p.: ill., table.

14.	Bohuslavskyi Mykolaivskyi (Bohuslav, St. Nikolas)	women's	cohabitation
15.	Lebedynskyi Mykolaivskyi (Lebedyn, St. Nikolas)	women's, 2 class	cohabitation
16.	Chyhyrynskyi Sviato-Troitskyi (Chyhyryn, Holy Trinity)	women's	cohabitation
17.	Vynohradskyi Uspenskyi (Irdyn, Dormition of the Virgin)	men's	cohabitation
18.	Zhabotynskyi Onufriivskyi (Zhabotyn, St. Onufriy)	men's	cohabitation
19.	Medvedivskyi Sviato-Mykolaivskyi (Medvedivka, Holy Trinity)	men's	cohabitation
20.	Moshnohirskyi Voznesenskyi (Moshny, Ascension of the Lord)	men's	cohabitation

The Conclusions. Thus, from the end of the 18th century the territorial boundaries of the Kyiv Eparchy were determined, which coincided with the administrative boundaries of the Kyiv province. The secularization reform of the Russian Empire, which at that time also spread to the Ukrainian lands, had a significant impact on the number and position of monasteries in the Eparchy. The number of the Orthodox monasteries was not stable there. If before secularization there were 40 Orthodox monasteries (2 stauropygial, 21 male and 17 female) on the territory of the Kyiv Eparchy, then at the beginning of the 20th century there were 21 of them – 1 lavra and 20 Eparchy ones (16 male and 4 female). The change in the number of monasteries was carried out as a result of closing, reorganization, change of status, transformation from male to female.

The synodal period, which in Ukraine falls on the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, determined the typology and structure of the Orthodox monasteries there. All of them were divided according to the territorial and geographical factor (urban, rural), the system of subordination, maintenance, management and size (full-time, part-time), according to the statute, which regulated the arrangement and way of life of the abode (communal, non-communal), by type of monastic settlements (monasteries, hermitages). All monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy were multi-functional, although some of them were called hospital, school, or working monasteries according to their functional specialization. During the post-reform period, the majority of Orthodox monasteries of the Kyiv Eparchy functioned as social stabilizers, and became centres of charity, education and upbringing, providing assistance to socially vulnerable sections of society.

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 did not receive any financial assistance for the research and publication of this scientific work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barsov, T. V. (1885). *Sbornyk deistvuiushchykh y rukovodstvennыkh tserkovnykh i tserkovno-hrazhdanskykh postanovlenii po vedomstvu pravoslavnoho ispovedanyia* [Collection of current and governing ecclesiastical and ecclesiastical-civil decrees on the department of the Orthodox confession]. Vol. 1. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

Barsov, T. V. (1896). *Sviateishyi Sinod v eho proshlom* [Holy Synod in its past]. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

Chystovich, Y. A. (1868). *Feofan Prokopovich i eho vremia* [Feofan Prokopovich and his time]. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

Chupys, O. V. (2013). *Sekuliaryzatsiini zakhody uriadiv Rosii u XVIII st.* [Secularization measures of Russian governments in the 18th century]. *Naukovi pratsi istorychnyрэòiв Pociї yoho fakultetu Zaporizkoho natsionalnoho universytetu, XXXV,* 36–42. [in Ukranian]

Dehtiarov, M., & Reutov, A. (1999). *Mykhailivskyi Zolotoverkhyi monastyr* [Mykhailivskyi Zolotoverkhyi Monastery]. Kyiv. [in Ukranian]

Denisov, L. Y. (1908). *Pravoslavnye monastyry Rossyiskoi ymperii.* [Orthodox monasteries of the Russian Empire]. Moskva. [in Russian]

Dzeman, M. Y. (2015). Tradytsiia tryiednosti likuvalnoho protsesu v ukrainskii medytsyni [Traditions of the trinity of the medical process in Ukrainian medicine] (Chastyna 1). *Praktychnyi likar, (4),* 63–73. [in Ukranian]

Horenko, L. (1992). Chyhyrynskyi Troitskyi zhinochyi monastyr [Chernihiv Trinity Convent]. *Rodovid*, (4), 59–66. [in Ukranian]

Horchakov, M. Y. (1868). *Monastyrskyi prykaz (1649 – 1725 h.): opyt istoryko-yurydycheskoho issledovaniia* [Monastic order (1649 – 1725): the experience of historical legal research]. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

Istoryia rossyiskoi ierarkhyy. (1807). *Istoryia rossyiskoi ierarkhyy, sobrannaia Novhorodskoi seminarii prefektom, filosofii uchitelem, sobornym ieromonakhom Amvrosiem* [The history of the Russian hierarchy, collected by the prefect of the Novgorod Seminary, philosophy teacher, cathedral hieromonk Ambrose]: V Moskve, pri Sinodalnoi tipohrafii, v 6-i chastiakh: 1807 – 1815 / Ch. 1. Moscva. [in Russian]

Ivanovskyi, V. (1905). *Russkoe zakonodatelstvo XVIII i XIX vv. v svoikh postanovlenyiakh otnositelno monashestvuiushchikh lits i monastirei: opyt istoriko-kanonicheskoho issledovaniia* [Russian legislation of the 18th and 19th centuries in its rulings concerning monastics and monasteries]. Kharkov. [in Russian]

Kalashnikov, S. V. (1896). *Alfavitnyi ukazatel deistvuiushchikh y rukovodstvennykh kanonycheskykh postanovlenyi, ukazov, opredelenii i rasporiazhenii Sviateisheho Pravitelstvuiushcheho Sinoda (s 1721 – 1895 h. vkliuchitelno) i hrazhdanskikh zakonov, otnosiashchikhsia k Dukhovnomu vedomstvu pravoslavnoho ispovedaniia* [Alphabetical index of current and governing canonical decrees, decrees, definitions and orders of the Most Holy Governing Synod (1721 – 1901 inclusive) and civil laws related to the Spiritual Department of the Orthodox Confession]. Kharkov. [in Russian]

Kedrov, N. Y. (1886). *Dukhovnyi rehlament v sviazy s preobrazovatelnoi deiatelnostiu Petra Velikoho* [Spiritual regulation in connection with the reformation deiatelnost of Peter the Great]. Moskva. [in Russian]

Kilesso, T. S. (1999). *Vydubitskyi monastir* [Vydubytskyi monastery]. Kyiv. [in Ukranian]

Kilesso, T. S. (2002). *Bratskii Bohoiavlenskyi monastyr i Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia* [Bratsky Epiphany Monastery and the Kyiv-Mohylianska Academy]. Kyiv [in Ukranian]

Kryzhanovska, O. (2001). *Kyievo-Florivskyi (Voznesenskyi) zhinochyi monastyr v dokumentakh ta materialakh XVI – pochatku XX st.* [Kyiv-Florivskyi (Voznesenskyi) nunnery in documents and materials of the 16th – the beginning of the 20th century]. Kyiv. [in Ukranian]

Kuznets, T. V. (2021). Nastoiateli kyivskykh cholovichykh monastyriv XIX – poch. XX st.: skladnyky yikh statusu [Abbots of Kyiv men's monasteries in the 19th century – the beginning of the 20th century: components of their status]. *Naukovi zapysky Vinnytskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Mykhaila Kotsiubynskoho. Seriia: Istoriia, (35),* 8–18. [in Ukranian]

Lavrinenko, N. (2012). *Hetmanskyi Pustynno-Mykolaivskyi Medvedivskyi monastyr* [Hetmansky Pustinno-Mykolaivskyi Medvedovsky monastery]. Cherkasy. [in Ukranian]

Lavrinenko, N. M. (2005). Uchast pravoslavnykh monastyriv Kyivskoi yeparkhii u systemi dukhovnoi osvity Rosiiskoi imperii (XIX – pochatok XX st.) [The participation of Orthodox monasteries of the Kyiv Diocese in the system of spiritual education of the Russian Empire (the 19th – the beginning of the 20th centuries)]. *Lavrskyi almanakh: Kyievo-Pecherska lavra v konteksti ukrainskoi istorii ta kultury: zbirnyk naukovych prats, (14),* 18–26. [in Ukranian]

Lavrinenko, N. M. (2006). *Z istorii Chyhyrynskoho Sviato-Troitskoho monastyria (zabuta obytel)* [From the history of Chyhyrynsky Holy Trinity Monastery (forgotten monastery)]. *Kyivska starovyna, (6),* 99–106. [in Ukranian]

Lavrinenko, N. M. (2009). *Pravoslavni monastyri Pivdennoi Kyivshchyny (sotsialno-ekonomichna diialnist). 1773 – 1917 rr*. [Orthodox monasteries of Southern Kyvshchyna (social and economic activist). 1773 – 1917]. Cherkasy. [in Ukranian].

Lastovska, O. O. (2013). Suchasna istoriohrafiia pytannia doslidzhennia pravoslavnykh monastyriv i chernetstva Cherkashchyny [Modern historiography of the issue of the study of Orthodox monasteries and monasticism in Cherkasy]. *Visnyk NAKKKiM. Seriia: Istoriia, (4),* 269–275. [in Ukranian]

Lomachynska, I. M. (2016). Rol pravoslavnykh monastyriv u formuvanni svitohliadnykh oriientyriv ukrainskoho suspilstva [The role of Orthodox monasteries in the formation of worldview orientations of Ukrainian society]. *Visnyk Cherkaskoho universytetu. Seriia: Filosofiia (2),* 61–70. [in Ukranian]

Lomachynska, I. M. (2015). *Monastyri Ukrainy* [Monasteries of Ukraine]. Kyiv. [in Ukranian]

Pashkovskyi, O. A. (2004). Hospodarska, osvitnia ta blahodiinytska diialnist Zhabotynskoho Sviato-Onufriivskoho cholovichoho monastyria [Economic, educational and charitable activities of the Jabotinsky St. Onuphrius Monastery]. *Pravoslavia–nauka–suspilstvo: problemy vzaiemodii: Materialy Druhoi Vseukrainskoi naukovo-praktychnoi konferentsii Cherkasy*, (pp. 111–113). Kyiv. [in Ukranian]

Pokrovskyi, Y. M. (1913). *Russkye eparkhii v XVI – XIX vv., ikh otkrytie, sostav i predely: opыt tserkovno-istoricheskoho, statisticheskoho i heohraficheskoho issledovaniia* [Russian dioceses in the 16th – 19th centuries, their discovery, composition and limits. Experience of church-historical, statistical and geographical research]. Kazan. [in Russian]

Polnoe sobranie zakonov. (1830a). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* [Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire] [Sobranie 1-e. S 1649 po 12 dekabria 1825 g.]. Vol. 6. SPb.: Tip 2-go Otd-niia Sobstv E. I. V. kantseliarii. [in Russian]

Polnoe sobranie zakonov. (1830b). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* [Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire] [Sobranie 1-e. S. 1649 po 12 dekabria 1825 g.]. Vol. 17. SPb.: Tip 2-go Otd-niia Sobstv E. I. V. Kantseliarii. [in Russian]

Polnoe sobranie zakonov. (1830c). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* [Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire] [Sobranie 1-e S 1649 po 12 dekabria 1825 g.]. Vol. 22. SPb.: Tip 2-go Otd-niia Sobstv E. I. V. Kantseliarii. [in Russian]

Polnoe sobranie zakonov. (1830d). *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* [Complete collection of laws of the Russian Empire] [Sobranie 1-e S 1649 po 12 dekabria 1825 g.]. Vol. 25. SPb.: Tip 2-go Otd-niia Sobstv E. I. V. Kantseliarii. [in Russian]

Popelnytska, O. (2005). Mykolaivskyi ta Bohoslovskyi Yordanski monastyri u Kyievi [Mykolaivskyi ta Bohoslovskyi Yordanski monasteries in Kyiv]. *Kyivska starovyna, (1),* 29–34. [in Ukranian]

Razieiasnitelnye postanovleniia. (1899). Razieiasnitelnye postanovleniia Sviateishego sinoda [Explanatory resolutions of the Holy Synod]. *Tserkovnye vedomosti. (11),* 65. [in Russian]

Rasporiazheniia. (1902a). Rasporiazheniia Sviateishego sinoda [Orders of the Holy Synod]. *Kievskie eparkhialnye vedomosti, (9),* 82. [in Russian]

Rasporiazheniia. (1902b). Rasporiazheniia Sviateishego sinoda [Orders of the Holy Synod]. *Tserkovnye vedomosti, (2),* 4 [in Russian].

Ratshyn, A. (1852). *Polnoe sobranye istorycheskikh svedenii o vsekh byvshykh v drevnosty y nyne sushchestvuiushchykh monastyriakh i primechatelnykh tserkvakh v Rossii* [A complete collection of historical information about all the monasteries and notable churches in Russia that were in antiquity and now exist]. Moskva. [in Russian]

Rostislavov, D. Y. (1876). *Opyt issledovaniia ob imushchestvakh y dokhodakh nashikh monastyrei* [Research experience about the property and income of our monasteries], Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

Stroev, P. (1877). *Spiski ierarkhov i nastoiatelei monastyrei Rossiiskoi tserkvy* [Lists of hierarchs and abbots of monasteries of the Russian Church]. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

Titlinov, B. V. (1905). *Pravitelstvo imperatritsy Anny Yoannovny v eho otnosheniiakh k delam pravoslavnoi tserkvy* [The government of Empress Anna Ioannovna in its relationship to the affairs of the Orthodox Church]. Vilna. [in Russian]

Vdovina, L. N. (1988). *Krestianskaia obshchina y monastyr v Tsentralnoi Rossii v pervoi polovine XVIII v.* [Peasant community and monastery in Central Russia in the first half of the 18th century]. Moskva. [in Russian]

Vecherskii, V. (2008). *Ukrainski monastyri* [Ukrainian Monasteries]. Kyiv: Nash chas. [in Ukranian]

Zavialov, A. A. (1900). *Vopros o tserkovnykh imenyiakh pri imperatritse Ekaterine II* [On church estates under Empress Catherine II]. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

Zverinskii, V. V. (1890-1897). *Material dlia istoriko-topohraficheskoho issledovaniia o pravoslavnykh monastyriakh v Rossyiskoi ymperii* [Material for historical and topographic research on Orthodox monasteries in the Russian Empire]. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

Zverynskii, V. V. (1887). *Monastyri v Rossiiskoi imperii* [Monasteries in the Russian Empire]. Sankt-Peterburg. [in Russian]

The article was received September 28, 2023.
Article recommended for publishing 30/05/2024.