

UDC 27-789.17-726.7

DOI: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197176

Mykhailo VILHUSHYNSKYI

PhD hab. (Law), Professor at the Administrative Law Department of the Law Faculty of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 60 Volodymyrska Street, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 01033 (m.vilgushynskyi@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0630-9055>

Yuriy STETSYK

PhD hab. (History), Associate Professor of the Department History of Ukraine, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, Ivan Franko Street, 38, 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/>)

Михайло ВІЛЬГУШИНСЬКИЙ

доктор юридичних наук, професор кафедри адміністративного права юридичного факультету Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, вул. Володимирська, 60, Київ, Україна, індекс 01033 (m.vilgushynskyi@ukr.net)

Юрій СТЕЦИК

доктор історичних наук, доцент кафедри історії України Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вулиця Івана Франка 38, Україна, індекс 82100 (stetsyk_u_o@ukr.net)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Vilhushynskyi, M. & Stetsyk, J. (2020). Interview protocol of Pr. Yosafat Makarevych Kremenets Basilian Monastery Hegumen (1774). *Skhidnoievropeyskyi Istorychnyi Visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 14, 28–35. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.14.197176

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL OF PR. YOSAFAT MAKAREVYCH KREMENETS BASILIAN MONASTERY HEGUMEN (1774)

Abstract. *The purpose of the research* is to investigate the manifestations of deviant behavior of Basilian monasticism in early modern times by examining the disciplinary case of Pr. Yosafat Makarevych. **The methodology of the research** is based on the analytical and synthetic criticism of the protocols, which were compiled by the commission, who was delegated by Svyatopokrovska province Protohegumen in order to investigate Kremenetskyi Monastery hegumen's behavior. The monastery inhabitants' testimony were compared with the hegumen's explanations in order to establish the objectivity of the submitted information. **The scientific novelty** is that for the first time the hegumen's disciplinary case has been introduced into the scientific circulation. **The Conclusions.** The typical manifestations of the Basilian monasticism's deviant behavior of the early modern times have been established, they were the following: traveling to different province monasteries in order to find comfortable living conditions and to avoid performing duties; waste of monastic funds for their own fortune; violation of the ascetic rule of the cloister in the monastery cells; maintaining relationships

with socialites; visiting socialites' private homes; alcohol abuse; discussing the relationship of the monastery community with the socialites; avoiding the observance of the liturgical monastic rule; the desire to separate from the community. On the basis of interrogation protocols, the procedure for reviewing the disciplinary cases of monasticism was reconstructed: the notification – the commission establishment – the interrogation protocols conclusion of the witnesses and the accused one on oath – the Provincial Government's consideration – making a decision.

Key words: hegumen, monastic community, proto-hegumen, commission, protocol, witnesses.

ПРОТОКОЛ ДОПИТУ НАСТОЯТЕЛЯ КРЕМЕНЕЦЬКОГО ВАСИЛІАНСЬКОГО МОНАСТИРЯ О. ЙОСАФАТА МАКАРЕВИЧА (1774 р.)

Анотація. *Мета дослідження* – дослідити прояви девіантної поведінки василіансько-го чернецтва ранньомодерного часу на прикладі розгляду дисциплінарної справи о. Йосафата Макаревича. **Методологія дослідження** – опирається на аналітичну та синтетичну критику протоколів, які уклала комісія, що була делегована протоігуменом Святопокровської провінції для розслідування поведінки настоятеля Кременецької обителі. Для встановлення об'єктивності подання інформації зіставлено свідчення насельників монастиря із поясненнями ігумена. **Наукова новизна** дослідження вбачається у використанні досі не запроваджені до наукового обігу дисциплінарної справи настоятеля. **Висновки.** Встановлено типові прояви девіантної поведінки василіанського чернецтва ранньомодерного часу: мандрювання по монастирях провінції з метою пошуку комфортних умов проживання та ухиляння від виконання обов'язків; розтрата монастирських коштів на власні забаганки; порушення аскетичного правила клявзури у монастирських келіях; підтримання відносин зі світськими особами; відвідування приватних будинків світських людей; зловживання спиртними напоями; обговорення взаємовідносин монастирської спільноти із світськими людьми; ухиляння від виконання літургійного монастирського правила; прагнення відокремитися від спільноти. На підставі протоколів допитів реконструйовано процедуру розгляду дисциплінарних справ чернецтва: повідомлення – утворення комісії – укладення протоколів допитів свідків та обвинувачуваного під присягою – розгляд Провінційною Управою – прийняття рішення.

Ключові слова: ігумен, монастирська спільнота, протоігумен, комісія, протокол, свідки.

The Problem Statement. Due to the current conditions of building the Basilian Order and determining the priority areas of its activity, there is a drastic need to pay attention to the discipline of monasticism. The Basilian Order being a corporate organization is governed by a statute (rules, constitution, rulebook) that has been subject to constant changes over the last four centuries owing to the challenges of the times. After all, the monks joined the secular people, who tried to bring to the monastery their secular demeanor and preferences. On the other hand, the Basilian monasteries, according to the unified charter, were not conceptual (closed) monastic congregations, but rather focused on pastoral and cultural and educational work in society. As a result, some monasticism deviant behavior could be found. Moreover, the monasticism deviant behaviour remains an unexplored problem to this day.

The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches. Most current studies, when studying the monasteries' history and culture, only pay attention to the prominent monks' activities (Dovbyshchenko, 2018). At the same time, the difficulties and worries that monasticism in daily life faced were left unaddressed. In general, Kremenetskyi monastery history remains virtually unexplored. Separate fragments of her Orthodox period are presented through the lens of the selective act documentation in S. Horin's work (Horin, 2012). Numerous researchers dealt with the issue and presented relevant references to the monastery's history, which could be found in the Basilian Order studies written by M. Vavryk, I. Patrylo, P. Pidruchnyi, B. Lorens (Vavryk, 1979; Patrylo, 1992; Pidruchnyi, 2018; Lorens, 2014). However, to date,

there are no special works, which have been created in ecclesiastical historiography up till the present day, either on the history of Kremenets monastery or on the deviant behavior of the monks. After all, modern Ukrainian historical science shows significant attempts to study the manifestations of a deviant behavior in the early modern era (Povsiakdennia, 2012).

The purpose of the article is to investigate the Basilian monasticism's deviant behavior manifestations of the early modern times on the example of the disciplinary case dedicated to Pr. Yosafat Makarevych.

The Statement of the Basic Material. Kremenets Monastery foundation and activities history until 1774 should be considered firstly. The first documentary mention of the intention to create a monastery dates back to 1633, when the Polish King Wladyslaw IV granted the privilege to Danylo Malynskyi, the "horunzhyi" and Lavrentiy Drevynsyi, the Volyn "chashnyk" to build the a fraternity of mercy, a school for the teaching of children, a monastery and accommodation for the monks of the rules of St. Basil, and a hospital for the poor people of the Greek rite, both noble and bourgeois origin, living in the vicinity of Kremenets (CSHAUL, f. 201, d. 4b, c. 613, p. 149). The following documentary mention of the temple and monastery already built at it is connected with the decree of the Royal Commission (Kremenets, 09.03.1636) on the division of temples between the Orthodox and the Uniates (CSHAUL, f. 201, d. 4b, c. 613, p. 149).

Therefore, it can be considered that during the years 1633 – 1636 the monastery was built, what's more, the church, the school and the hospital under it were built. The printing house operated for a long time at the monastery. The monastery belonged to the jurisdiction of Lutsk-Ostroh Orthodox Bishop (Lorens, 2014, p. 436). Although the above-mentioned diocese in 1702 annexed the Kyivan Unity Metropolis, Kremenets Monastery did not recognize the unified jurisdiction of the Lutsk bishop until 1725 (Vavryk, 1979, p. 197).

In 1739, with the formation of the Saint Protectione Province of the Order of St. Basil the Great, Kremenetskyi Monastery changed its jurisdiction under the rule of Lutsk bishop to the Basilian Proto-hegumen (Patriylo, 1992, p. 195). There were only four monks (three hieromonks and one brother), who lived in the monastery in 1740 (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 1194, p. 13). Such a small number of the monastic community led to the fact that the Dubno's Provincial Meeting of 1745 decided to annex Kremenetskyi Monastery to Zahayatskyi Monastery because of insufficient income from the foundations to maintain a fixed number of eight inhabitants (Vavryk, 1979, p. 27). Subsequently, the monastery's financial provision improved and as early as in 1754 it increased the number of inhabitants to seven monks (Catalogus, 1954, p. 104). In 1774 eight inhabitants lived in the monastery (six hieromonks – Yosafat Makarevych¹, Antonyi Medem², Hratsian Parnytskyi³, Deodat Patynskyi⁴, Yosafat Morhylets⁵, Lev Dyshynskyi⁶ and two brothers – Pimen Onykovskyi⁷, Anastasiy Strus⁸) (Catalogus, 1773). The abbot of the monastery since 1773 was Pr. Yosafat Makarevich, who, according to the monastic

¹ **Yosafat Makarevych**, secular name – Ivan, the son of Stephen and Catherine. He was born in August 1730 in the territory of Przemysl. He completed one year of Rhetorics at Sambir School. He entered monasticism on August 16, 1750 in the Dobromyl Monastery. After a year of ascetic testing, he made the monastic vows of a professor. Sent to Hoschi at a rhetoric studio where he studied for one year. In 1752 he was sent to Lutsk to philosophical studios. After two years of studying, he was appointed as the preacher at the Cathedral. After a year of fulfilling these duties, he was sent to the Theological Studios in Brownsberg. After completing his studies, he returned to the Saint Protectione Province, where in 1759 he received priestly ordinances from the hands of Lutsk bishop Sylvester Rudnytskyi in Varkovychi. Yosafat Makarevych was appointed as the preacher at the monastery in Pidubtsyakh, where he stayed for 12 weeks, he was sent as the Guest to perform the prefect's duties of the school and the preacher. Later on he moved to the Kremenets Monastery as a missionary. Three years later he was sent to Pidubtsi, where he was a preacher. For a year he was appointed as the Philosophy Professor at the Terebovlya Monastery. In 1765 he was sent to St. George's Cathedral in Lviv on the canon. For up to two years he was sent to Dobromyl for teaching the Speculative Theology. A year later, he returned to Lviv in order to teach Theology and fulfill the duties of the Vicar of the St. George's Cathedral. For two years he was appointed as the Rector of the monastery in Hoshchi. In 1773 he became the Kremenets monastery Hegumen, ruling for only one year. Later he was sent to Zahoriv as a preacher, who conducted church service only on holidays. During the years 1776 – 1778 he was also a preacher in Pidubtsyakh and Pochaiv. He died in 1794 in Pochaiv (SNLL-SM, f. 3, p. 435, p. 635).

² **Antony Medem**, secular name – Adam, the son of Alexander and Petrunelia. He was born on January 1, 1730 in Podlisk. He joined the monasticism in Pochaiv in 1747, where after a year of novitiate he made the ascetic vows of the professor. In January 1749 he was appointed as the treasurer to Milchi, where he lived for three years. In February 1751, he received deacon consecrations from the hands of Lutsk bishop; Svyatokoprovsk Province – the Saint Protectione Province Teodosiy Rudnitskyi. Subsequently, on May 9, 1753, Lviv Bishop Lev Sheptytskyi gave him the priestly ordinances. He was appointed chaplain and choirman to monasteries in Satanov and Lanivtsi. In February 1762 he was sent to Pidhirtsi as a chaplain and cashier. On August 5, 1767, he was sent to Lubar to serve as treasurer and parish priest, where he resided for four years and six months. From there he moved to Kremenets, where he was appointed as the parish priest and prefect of the structure. In 1774 he was sent to Pochaev, where he was also a prefect of construction, and from there to Hoshcha to the post of curate of the monastery. In 1776 he was appointed the Vicar and Prefect of construction in the Krasnopushiv Monastery. In 1778 he became the Prefect of construction in Uyazdov. He died in Lutsk in 1792 (SNLL–SM, f. 3, c. 614, p. 58).

³ **Parnytskyi Hratsian**, secular name – Hryhoriy, the son of Andrew and Kseniya. He was born in September 1737 in Ozahowiec, Volyn Voivodeship. He graduated from the Kremenets School of Rhetoric. July 29, 1759 he entered the monasticism in Pochaev, where by the year of the novitiate July 30, 1760 made the ascetic vows of the professor. In August 1760 he was sent to Lavriv to philosophical studios. After completing two years of study in August 1762, he was sent to Lubar for Primary School Teaching. On July 14, 1762, he received the priestly ordinances from the hands of Bishop Antonin Adam Młodowski. On August 5, 1764, he was sent to Pidhirtsi to study at Dogmatic Theology. Upon completion of his studies on July 2, 1766 he was appointed preacher for the holidays at the monastery in Piddybtsi. A year later he was sent to Krystynopol to fulfill the duties of a missionary, where he worked for six years. From there he was sent to the Kremenetskyi monastery, where he was also a missionary priest, and since 1774 was appointed as the Rector of the same monastery. He died in Tryhirya in 1793 (SNLL–SM, f. 3, c. 435, p. 438).

⁴ **Patynskyi Deodat**, secular name – Tom, the son of Ivan and Anna. He was born on January 30, 1740 in the village. The Vivihovtsi of the Podolian Voivodeship. He graduated syntax class at the Kremenets school. He entered monasticism on July 25, 1763 in Pochaiv, where after a year of study in the novitiate July 25, 1764 he made the ascetic vows of the professor. Sent to Hoshchi's Rhetoric Studio. In August 1766 sent to Lavriv to Philosophical Studios (1 year). From there he was sent to Zamosc to continue his Philosophical Studies. After their completion, he went to the Pidhirtsi Monastery for Theological Studies. Two years later he graduated and was appointed a preacher in the Zahoriv Monastery. He was subsequently sent to preach in Brusyliv. In two years he returned to the Kremenetskyi monastery, where in 1773 – 1774 he was appointed second missionary. From there he was sent to Puhinok, where from 1775 to 1776 he was a Confessor and First Missionary. 10.07.1776 arrived in Uman as a missionary. 01.09.1778 went to Lysyanskyi monastery, where he was appointed as the hegumen of the monastery, and also acted as the First Missionary and Confessor. 09.08.1779 returned to Uman from Piddubtsi and was appointed as the preacher on Sundays. He died 1780 (SNLL–SM, f. 3, c. 614, p. 257).

⁵ **Morhylets Yosafat**, secular name – John, the son of Peter and Catherine. He was born on September 12, 1746 in the village. Koskiv, Volyn Voivodeship. He graduated from the Lyubar School of Poetry. He entered monasticism in Pochaiv on August 24, 1764. After studying in the novitiate on August 15, 1766 he made the monastic vows of a Professor. He was sent to Hoscha at the Rhetoric Studio (2 years), and later to the Philosophical Studies to Zahaisiv (2 years), to Theological Studies at the Vilnius Papal Seminary (St. Joseph Seminary) (4 years). After completing his studies, he returned to the territory of the Saint Protectione Province and received the priestly ordinations. In 1773 he was sent to the Kremenetskyi Monastery as a preacher. A year later he was sent to Krystynopolskiy Monastery to fulfill his duties as a preacher. 1775 Preacher in Lubar. In 1776 he moved to the monastery in Hoshchi. From 1777 to 1778 he was a Preacher and Prefect of the Convict in Lubar. In 1780 he was sent to the Zymnenskyi Monastery to perform the duties of the hegumen. He was later appointed as the Rector of the Lubarskyi Basilian College. 24.08.1784 arrived in Uman, where on September 1st he was appointed as the Hegumen of the Monastery and the Rector of the school. He died in Uman in 1794, being the Rector and the Provincial Adviser (SNLL–SM, f. 3, c. 435, p. 636).

⁶ **Dyshynskyi Lev**, secular name – Lyka, the son of Vasil and Anastasia. He was born in 1728 in Drohobych, Przemysl land of the Russian Voivodeship. He was accepted to the choir and obedience on 04.07.1749 in Pochaiv, where after a year of study at the Novitiate school on 14.07.1750 he made the monastic vows of a Professor. After completing his Monastic Studies (Rhetoric, Philosophy, Theology), he received the priestly ordinations and was appointed to carry out the duties of a Treasurer in various monasteries of the Saint Protectione Province. He was the Hegumen in Yasenytsi, the Treasurer in Kremenets, the Vicar in Lutsk, the Treasurer in Vicina, the Choristor in Zahorov (1776), Lublin. Nyzkynychi (1779, Parish Priest, Vicar), Krekhiv (before 1787), Lviv St. Onufrii (Confessor, Treasurer since 1787), St. Ivan in Lviv (since 1789 was the treasurer). He died in 1793 in the Galician province (Stetsyk, 2019, p. 481).

⁷ **Onykovskyi Pimen**, secular name – Peter, the son of Vasil and Anna. Born in June 1725 in Pochaiv. He joined the monasticism in Pochaiv on December 23, 1746, where after the school of novitiate on February 2, 1748 he made the ascetic vows of the Professor. In April 1761 he was appointed assistant of the structure to Nyzkynych, and later went to other monasteries of the province: August 14, 1764 to Zahorov, February 11, 1770 to Milchi, 1773 to Kremenets. He died in 1784 (SNLL–SM, f. 3, c. 436, p. 958).

⁸ **Strus Anastasiy**, secular name – Andrew, the son of Auxentius and Yuliana. He was born in 1730, entered monasticism on 23.04.1769 in the Straklivskyi Monastery. After two years of ascetic testing in the Pochayiv Novitiate on May 10, 1771, he made the profession of a Professor. Later on, he returned to the Strakliv Monastery to fulfill his duties as a visiting-professor. In 1773 – 1774 the visiting-novice of the monastery in Kremenets. From 1775 to 1776 he was a novice in the Strusiv Monastery, where in 1776 he received the priestly ordinances from the hands of Lviv Bishop Lev Sheptytskyi and was sent to the Nyzkynetskyi Monastery to fulfill the duties of the Procurator. From 1777 to 1779, the church was built at the Temple of Lublin Monastery. He died in Krystynopol in 1790, being the hegumen of this monastery. (SNLL–SM, f. 3, c. 614, p. 42).

community, was marked by deviant behavior. The monastery fraternity twice (June 10 and August 21, 1774) reported to the Provincial Administration, which resided in the Pochaiv Monastery, about the unsatisfactory government of the monastery hegumen, according to their complaints: the monastery's condition was unsatisfactory; the hegumen was constantly on the move, returned from a business trip sick and infirm; had no vision of running a monastery; did not keep order in collecting provisions; nothing was done without his consent and it was difficult to agree with him; did not adhere to an ascetic cloister (there were often socialites in the abbot's cell, especially women); visited private homes frequently, which was not the hegumen's responsibility; complained about the monks that they did not work to the socialites, that he should take care of everything; performed liturgy rarely; did not come to the choir and hegumen; had no respect for the monastic life (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 1248, pp. 7–8 v).

On behalf of Pr. Onufriy Bratkovskiy Order of Saint Basil the Great (O.S.B.G.), Univ Archimandrite and Proto-Hegumen of the Saint Protectione Province; a commission was formed to investigate the monastery community's complaint against the hegumen of the monastery. The commission consisted of Pr. Platon Hudz, Zahoriv Monastery Hegumen, Pr. Yeronim Striletskyi and Pr. Corneliy Lavrovych from Pochayiv Monastery. On September 14, 1774, they arrived at Kremenets Monastery and interviewed witnesses and the rector. The commission sent the poll records to the Provincial Office (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 1248, p. 3).

Five witnesses were interviewed in order to review the behavior of Priest Yosafat Makarevych, the monastary's hegumen, the following questions were asked:

1. How often did the hegumen leave the abbey, what for, where did he go?
2. Has the hegumen in the monastery been ever drunk?
3. Did the hegumen visit the socialite's private homes?
4. Have any women visited the hegumen's cell?
5. Has the rule of cloister been enforced in the monastery?
6. Has the hegumen ever slandered or berated the monks in front of the socialites?
7. How often has the hegumen conducted church service?
8. Has the hegumen ever been in the choir and refectory together with the inhabitants of the monastery?

The witnesses gave the negative answers to the above-mentioned questions and provided a clearly negative characterization of the hegumen's behavior (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 1248, pp. 3–5). Instead, most of the allegations, during the interrogation, were denied by the Hegumen, he admitted some of them, however, was trying to justify their urgent need. (SATR, f. 258, d. 3, c. 1248, pp. 2–2 v). There fore, we include in our article Pr. Yosafat's Makarevich, the Hegumen interview protocol of interrogation, which outlines the basic facts that the accused of the deviant behavior tried to justify. As a result, the Protohegumen Onufriy Bratkovskiy released Pr. Yosafat Makarevych from fulfilling the Kremenetskyi Basilian monastery Hegumen's duties and sent him to Zahorivskiy Monastery, where he was appointed as the preacher, who held church service only on holidays. Subsequently, he was not appointed to any administrative positions in the Order of Saint Basil the Great (SNLL–SM, f. 3, c. 435, p. 635).

The Conclusions. The typical manifestations of the Basilian monasticism's deviant behavior of the early modern times have been established, they were the following: traveling to different province monasteries in order to find comfortable living conditions and to avoid performing duties; waste of monastic funds for their own fortune; violation of the ascetic rule of the cloister in the monastery cells; maintaining relationships with socialites; visiting socialites' private homes; alcohol abuse; discussing the relationship of the monastery

community with the socialites; avoiding the observance of the liturgical monastic rule; the desire to separate from the community. On the basis of interrogation protocols, the procedure for reviewing the disciplinary cases of monasticism was reconstructed: the notification – the commission establishment – the interrogation protocols conclusion of the witnesses and the accused one on oath – the Provincial Government's consideration – making a decision. It should be mentioned that during the monasteries' audits, the visiting commission delegated not only the the monastery's property inventory, its profits and expenses, but also paid considerable attention to the observance of the ascetic rules in the monastery community. Hence, a survey was conducted between the Hegumen and the inhabitants of the monastery, aimed at finding out whether the ascetic rules were obeyed in the monastery. There were cases of conflict between the hegumen and the monastery fraternity, which were being investigated by the province's visitors, which also included judicial functions.

Acknowledgments. The authors 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 and publication of this article.

The document

[Interview protocol of Pr. Yosafat Makarevych, Kremenets Basilian Monastery Hegumen, Kremenets, 14.09.1774 year]

Str.2 //

[header is damaged]

1-mo. W tych klasztorach takowe moie ustawiczne bywanie w [...] Bohoiawlenyie y teraz na rekolekcyach. W Strakłowie [...] postami aliis przed masnicą gdzie nemożny obedwa tygodnie [...] musieli pod czas wizyty tamtensi mieszkance dać swiactwo.

2-do. Jm. X. Medem zawsze absolutnie rządził się o żadne czynności mnie nierado. Pieniądzy komu chciał pozyczał iako pokazuje się z długow, powinnościom slusarzowi hultajowi bez wiadomości nie tylko moiey ale y antecessora [...] 2 czyli więcey oprócz czynszu więcey iak 18 zll. i uniesie za niego ręszty piędz [...] na 8 zll., a gdy 14 p[re]sentis tu znajdował sie zamek/ na którym sam klasztornych piędz odebrania zawsze pokładał nadzieie/ plus minus zll. [...] dla Jmc. Pana Czarneckiego zrobiony, clam kuznię odemknowszy wziął [...] za 8 zll. oddał, takim że sposobem wyniosł z szpiklerza chomut y z [...]. Na jurydykach kogo y za co chciał osadzał. Gości y domowych bez względu ubostwa traktował, bo na S. Bazyli y Bohoiawlenyie oprócz wina y miodu iac alembikową w klasztorze wodka, prawic dla samych kaplanow y summe za gdanka zll. 9 zapłacił. Kamienie powsemu 6, te wapno y cegła iak powywozone drzewo o to Bogu wiadomo, gdy bowiem raz spitałem się po sumu [...] od oprawy sztuki drzewa odpowiedziały n. faltor po 2 zll. czyli po 40 zll., a gdy znienna spytałem maystru powiedziały po 30 zll. y to zdaie mi się wiele. O tych większych interessach ani się radził ani powiedziały ale sam ich według swego zadowolenia uspakoił. Parobkow y inna czeladz odprawiał przyimował tym płacił co się podobało bez żadney opowiedzi. Do kąd chciał wychodził albo wyiezdza że często jego niemożna się było dopytać gdzie znajduje się, na mieyscach bywał z nych i pogorszeniem (iako mi swieccy donosili; na to przysięgni żem go w [...] celij za zamknięciem drzwiami sam na sam zastał z młodycą, z parobkom piie nocnie/ co wyswiadczy Jm. X. Głowacki/ powiedziały nieluchaycie starszego bo on dzisiay starszym, a ia jutrom, mnie słuchaycie, ia wasz Pan, iakoż gdym coś rozkazywał iednemu, odszedzsy odemnie do drugich powiedziały. [...] bude słuchaty ne ia; u

mene Pan Wikary wielokrotnie ile kassiera wysyłałem po prawdy że a te niechciał wyiechać iednak że, gdzie by więcey zaległa oprócz PP. [...] Szawłowski, Podhorskiego, Kosynskiego kahału ale to dawno przed mnim Jm. P. Zagorowskiemu ile komissarzowi powiatu niemożna się [...], dla jurydyki Jm. P. Oraguński daleko mieszka, a mać niemożna pewnie kiedy zostali Jm. P. Małachowskiego niewiedzieć gdzie szukać etc. Co się [...] upiiania się tego nieprzesza że się zdarzało ale z gośćmi, sam na sam napiie się [...] abym kazał kiedy iedne flaszke przynieść, lubo teraz każe dla zagrzania niepiiac wodka. To iednak moje napiiania się nie były takowe by przepił hluzdy albo walał się, chociaż nie bez choroby.

Ad 3-tium et 4-tum. Prawda to że bywała Kielbasowska w klasztorzu, która na sam przod sprawu[...] dzeł X. Duszynski zalecając ich do klasztoru przychyłność prawda y to że by to raz czy dwa z mężem była raz czy dwa sama przy chłopcu bez zamknięcia drzwi ale w dzień, była pod czas prowodow z innemi, była na koniec z niże wspomnioną staruszką Wiszniowiecka przy obecności X. Medema kiedy szynka y kielbasy na swieto wzięte darował, żeby zaś w nocy kiedy umac[...] była parobka Woyciecha po nią posyłałem prośze aby albo pomieniony Woyciech pod przysięgą zeznał albo ia był przypuszczony do juramentu. Prawda y to że ani przed tym ani teraz niesłysza żeby to mieysce było podeyszło nie byłem razy trzy lub cztery w Kielbasowskiego, byłem albo przejeżdżaią od samego prawie gwałtem zaproszony, albo dla interesu iako powracaiaj z Poczajowa u Wagilia Bożego Narodzenia dla ryb, a w wielki post dla kulbas

Str.2 (zw) //

[...] byłem w trzech karczmach w jedney u Jm. P. Borkoskiego; w drugiey u Jmci pisarza grod[zkiego] z tym piim gorzałkę, w trzeciey Jm. P. komornika plententa. Jmci pani starościny Niżynskiey, bylam y u Jozefa Cereliba [...] X. Duszynski poco prawda to że mnie tam iedzącego z tym że xiędzem stał pan podstolic Rotharyusz dobrze znajomy, więcey nie-pamiętam u kogorz zas będą nie przesze żeby przynajmniey nieskosztował gorzałki albo szklanką niewypił miodu y przyszedszy żebym niechorował na palpitacyą i te zaś wyrażone domy ieżeli są nieprzystoyna prośze osadzu. A kobieta nazwisko Wiszniowiecka Bogu duszę winna w tey okolisznosci y mowie na wstyd bym się widząc jey pobożność, prawda że zas do mnie siedzącego przed szpeklerzom y patrzącego na fabryke przyszło, uprzykrzaszniej wospan mnie a Kielbasowska iest teraz u mnie o tuż Waspan sam pudz y mow żeby to było skonczonno. Ja na fundamencie bliskości bo zaraz przy wrotach poszedła naywięcey kwadrans w przytomności tey że Wiszniowieckiey zabawiwszy z dwoma tam stoiącemi paleztrantami powrociłem do klasztoru, że zaś Wiszniowiecka mnie niemowiąc wyszła na prog zobaczywszy XX. Patynskiego y Morgulca ocych pod refektarzem upatniących z kąd wyszła ile boiazliwa staruszka zacza słysząc kochanych BB[ratciow] zisła o mnie po miescie przed swieckimi sunie dla tego to uczynila, ia nic nieuważaiac powrociłem y to się raz tylko trafiło, ale nie sam na sam y to w dzień, prośze żeby ta staruszką była przynajmniey [...].

Ad 5-tum. Nb. u Kielbasowskiego nie tylko obiada ani sniadania lub podwieczorka nigdy. Niezadly klawzury zachowac niemożna mowic żeby niechciałem ale niemogł zaraz po przyjeździe zaprosił się stać w klasztorze WJm. Pan pisarz grodzki po nim Pan pisarz ziemski do których rozney kondycyi ludzie uczęszczali, forty y firty niemarz wię komu podobało się wchodził, oprócz tego bywały okolicznosci bez tych mieszkancow przyią przychodzących, a gdzież niemaiać izby gosciny.

Ad 6-ta. Owszem mnie swieccy donosza że Jmc o mnie, nie ia o nich, przed swieckimi galdat.

Ad 7-ma. To prawda, bo zabawiwszy się z goscmi do pozna musze dłużej poleżac a wstawszy zaraz interesa, dla których wiele razy pacierze opuszczone prożto iednak zakrystyjan niemiała krzywdy, ponieważ razem więcey iak 120 mszy oddalem.

Ad 8-ma. I to prawda że gdy Jchmosć codziennie kiedy im się podoba idie spać, a ia [...] iak to pod czas sądow y teraz do dwonastey łedwie niemdlezac nieגיע albo czas nieszprow

z goscmi zabawic się musze, albo gdy w lesie robile fabryke pilnować musiałem żeby daremny niebył expens, wszak przyznaia /ieżeli nie zachcą/ Jmc X. Jankowski y Jm X. Smotrycz/ ja y przy mnie działo się/ Medem zaraz po obiedzie szedl spać y spał poki się podobało, a na fabryce no iak chciano o to samo będzie w Poczajowie ieżeli sawołyie, a potyh do wygnania y groźność nie będą wykorzenione.

Quos responsiones si opus fuerit puł verae sunt poratum esse ma juxto congrare offero, reserowadz od siebe ut eas melocrare possam, in fidea me subscribo Datt Cremeneći dię 14 9-bris V[etus] S[tylus] 1774 A[nno]

P[ater] J[osafat] Makarewicz O[rdo] S[ancti] B[azilii] M[agni] m[anus] p[ropr]ia

The historical source: State Archiwum of Ternopil Region, f. 258, d. 3, c. 1248, p. 2–2 v

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Catalogus, (1954). *Catalogus monasteriorum et personarum provinciae protectionis B. V. Mariae Ordinis S. Basilii Magni. Anni 1754. Analecta OSBM. Ser. II. Sec. I. Vol. XL. Romae: PP. Basiliani, 1979, 102–124 [in Latin]*

Catalogus, (1773). *Catalogus monasteriorum Ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni provinciae Protectionis Beatissimae Virginis Mariae cum residentibus in iis Religiosis Patribus et Fratribus ex Anno 1773 a Mense Septembri ad Septembrem 1774 Anni. Typis S.R.M. Monaste: Poczajovien: O.S.B.M. Anno Domini, 1773. [in Latin]*

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

Dovbyshchenko, M. (2018). Povnennia z nebuttia: rukopysna ta drukovana spadshchyna dermanskoho arkhimandryta Ivana Dubovycha [Return from Nothingness: The Manuscript and Printed Legacy of Derman Archimandrite Ivan Dubovych]. *Ostrozkyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk*, 10, 181–188. [in Ukrainian]

Horin, S. (2012). *Monastyri Lutsko-Ostrozkoï yeparkhii kintsia XV – seredyny XVII st.: funkcionuvannia i miste u volynskomu sotsiumi [Monasteries of the Lutsk-Ostroh Diocese of the late XVth – mid-XVIIth centuries: functioning and place in the Volyn society]. Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia”, 560 p. [in Ukrainian]*

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

Lvivska Natsionalna Naukova biblioteka imeni Vasylia Stefanyka. Viddil rukopysiv, [Scientific National Library of the Vasyl Stefanyk of Lviv. Sector of Manuscript – SNLL–SM]

Patrylo, I. (1992). Narys istorii Vasyliian vid 1743 do 1839 r. [Essay on the history of the Basilians from 1743 to 1839]. *Analecta OSBM. Ser. II. Sec. I. Vol. 48. Romae, 183–278 [in Ukrainian]*

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

Povsiakdennia. (2012). *Povsiakdennia rannomodernoi Ukrainy. Istorychni studii v 2-kh tomakh. T. 1: Praktyky, kazusy ta devyatsii povsiakdennia [Everyday life of early modern Ukraine. Historical studios in 2 vol. Vol. 1: Practices, cases and deviations of everyday life]. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NAN Ukrainy, 328 p. [in Ukrainian]*

Stetsyk, Yu. (2019). Drohobytiski mishchany – podvyzhnyky Vasyliianskoho Chynu (XVIII st.): biohrafichni notatky [Drohobych burghers – ascetics of the Basilian Order (18th century): Biographical notes]. *Drohobytyskyi kraieznavchyi zbirnyk*, XXI, 478–484. [in Ukrainian]

Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy, m. Lviv [Central State Historical Archives of Ukraine, Lviv – CSHAUL]

Vavryk, M. (1979). Narys rozvytku i stanu Vasyliianskoho Chyna XVII – XVIII st. Topohrafichno-statystychna rozvidka [An outline of the development and condition of the Basilian Order of the XVIIth – XVIIIth centuries. Topographic and statistical research]. *Analecta OSBM. Ser. II. Sec. I. Vol. XL. Romae, 217 p. [in Ukrainian]*

The article was received on May 29, 2019.

Article recommended for publishing 26/02/2020.