

УДК 271.2.327(477+470)

**UKRAINIAN ECCLESIASTICAL DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS
DISPATCHED TO RUSSIA FROM THE SECOND HALF
OF THE 17th CENTURY TO THE EARLY 18th CENTURY**

**УКРАЇНСЬКІ ЦЕРКОВНІ ПОСОЛЬСТВА ДО РОСІЙСЬКОЇ
ДЕРЖАВИ В ДРУГІЙ ПОЛОВИНІ XVII – НА ПОЧАТКУ
XVIII СТОЛІТЬ**

**УКРАИНСКИЕ ЦЕРКОВНЫЕ ПОСОЛЬСТВА В РОССИЙСКОЕ
ГОСУДАРСТВО ВО ВТОРОЙ ПОЛОВИНЕ XVII – НАЧАЛЕ
XVIII ВЕКОВ**

Kagamlyk S.

Phd, Senior Researcher of Center Ukrainian Studies of Philosophy faculty of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. E-mail: kagam@i.ua

Кагамлик С. Р.

Кандидат історичних наук, старший науковий співробітник Центру українознавства філософського факультету Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка. E-mail: kagam@i.ua

Кагамлык С. Р.

Кандидат исторических наук, старший научный сотрудник Центра украиноведения философского факультета Киевского национального университета имени Тараса Шевченко. E-mail: kagam@i.ua

Abstract. *The article analyses the activity of Ukrainian church embassies in the Russian state in the second half of the XVII – early XVIII century, based on the materials of two leading Kyiv cells – the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra and the Mohyla Academy at the Kyiv Brotherhood Monastery, which had special privileges. The main goal for the Kyiv-Pechersk monastery's leadership was to preserve the title of the laurel and the right stauropigy, as well as the canonical submission to the Patriarch of Constantinople at that time. The priority of Kyiv Mohyla Academy was a confirmation its status as a higher educational institute and its material support by the Russian government. To defend these rights in conditions of Russian centralism was the main task of special monastic commissioners, who performed the duties of church advocates, defenders of their monasteries. The article concludes that due to the high level of education, organizational skills and diplomatic trust of Ukrainian church messengers, they managed to achieve significant success in defending the main interests of Kyiv cells – the special status for Pechersk Monastery and the right of a higher educational institute for the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. The mission of Ukrainian ambassadors of the 60-ies of the XVII century had an important church-political significance. They had forced the leaders of Russian state to realize the rejection of Ukrainian clergy of the Moscow protectorate and detained the subordination of the Kyiv Metropolitanate for twenty years.*

Key words: *Orthodox Church, Church embassies, Ukrainian church elite, Russian state, Russian centralizm, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, Kyiv Mohyla Academy.*

Анотація. *У статті аналізується діяльність українських церковних посольств до Російської держави у другій половині XVII – на початку XVIII ст. на матеріалах двох про-*

відних київських осередків – Києво-Печерської лаври та Могилянської академії при Києво-братському монастирі, які мали особливі привілеї. Головною метою для керівництва Києво-Печерського монастиря на той час було збереження титулу лаври і права ставропігії, а також підпорядкування Константинопольському патріарху. Водночас для Києво-Могилянської академії пріоритетним було підтвердження російським урядом її статусу вищого навчального закладу та його матеріальне забезпечення. Відстояти ці права в умовах російського централізму було головним завданням особливих монастирських уповноважених, які, крім дипломатичних функцій у столицях Російської держави, виконували обов'язки церковних адвокатів, захисників довірених їм обителів. Робиться висновок, що завдяки високій освіченості, організаційним здібностям і дипломатичному хисту українських церковних посланців їм вдалося досягти значного успіху і відстояти головні інтереси київських осередків – особливий статус Печерського монастиря та права вищого навчального закладу для Києво-Могилянської академії. Місії українських посланців 60-х років XVII ст. мали важливе церковно-політичне значення. Вони змусили зверхників Російської держави усвідомити несприйняття українським духовенством Московського протекторату і на двадцять років затримали підпорядкування Київської митрополії.

Ключові слова: Православна Церква, церковні посольства, українська церковна еліта, Російська держава, російський централізм, Києво-Печерська лавра, Києво-Могилянська академія.

Аннотация. *Статья анализирует деятельность украинских церковных посольств в Российском государстве второй половины XVII – начала XVIII в. на материалах двух ведущих киевских центров – Киево-Печерской лавры и Могиланской академии при Киево-братском монастыре, имеющим особенные привилегии. Главной целью руководства Киево-Печерского монастыря того времени было сохранение титула лавры и права ставропигии, а также канонического подчинения Константинопольскому патриарху. В то же время для Киево-Могиланской академии приоритетным было подтверждение российским правительством ее статуса высшего учебного заведения и его материальное обеспечение. Отстаивать эти права в условиях российского централизма было главным заданием особенных монастырских уполномоченных, исполняющих обязанности церковных адвокатов, защитников доверенных им обителів. Делается вывод, что благодаря высокой образованности, организационным способностям и дипломатическому умению украинских церковных посланников им удалось достичь значительного успеха и отстоять главные интересы киевских центров – особенный статус Печерского монастыря и права высшего учебного заведения Киево-Могиланской академии. Миссии украинских посланников 60-х годов XVII в. имели важное церковно-политическое значение. Они вынудили руководителей Российского государства осознать неприятие украинским духовенством Московского протектората и на двадцать лет задержали подчинение Киевской митрополии.*

Ключевые слова: Православная Церковь, церковные посольства, украинская церковная элита, Российское государство, российский централизм, Киево-Печерская лавра, Киево-Могиланская академия.

The current problem. The present time is rife with parallel processes that echo the early modern period of Ukraine's history, when members of the Ukrainian elite were forced to stand up for their fundamental rights being exposed to the pressure of Russian centralism. This is especially relevant to the country, against which aggression is being committed with the religious factor actively employed in the Ukrainian context for sectarian and political divisions.

After Ukraine was joined to Russia under the Treaty of Pereyaslav, it was essential for the Ukrainian church elite to retain all its rights and privileges previously granted by Lithuanian princes and Polish kings. However, with the Ukrainian Metropolitanate falling under control of the Moscow Patriarchate in 1686 and all the authority being centralised in Russia, the Ukrainian Orthodox Church began to lose its positions. The original terms for the change of canonical jurisdiction made it possible for the Church's leaders to keep its erstwhile status under Russian rule. As a result, the main task confronting the Ukrainian church elite was to safeguard its old rights and privileges, which was to be accomplished by sending special delegations to capital cities in Russia.

The review of major research efforts in the area. The efforts pursued by the Ukrainian Ecclesiastic Missions to Russia in the period spanning between the second half of the 17th century and the early 18th century is an area of research that has been given a small amount of scholarly attention. Primarily, this issue was investigated in different contexts by pre-Soviet scholars. For example, S. Golubyev [*Golubev*, 1900; *Golubev*, 1888; *Golubev*, 1901] and M. Petrov [*Petrov*, 1895] touched upon the question when writing on the history of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. As well as that, V. Einhorn [*Eingorn*, 1899] and K. Kharlampovych [*Kharlampovich*, 1914] dealt with the issue in question in their research on Russian-Ukrainian relations. F. Tittov focused on the problem as he gave insight into relations between the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (Kyiv Monastery of the Caves) and the ruling Romanov dynasty. Some materials on the subject were printed in the collection of documents entitled "The Archives of Southern and Western Russia Compiled and Published by the Archeographic Committee" [1] and "The Archives of South-Western Russia Published by the Committee for the Study of Ancient Acts" [2]. As regards modern research, one can cite a number of works that are in some way relevant to the issue in question. Among them are efforts by S. Plohiy [*Plohiy*, 2006], Z. Kohut [*Kohut*, 1996], V. Mordvintsev [*Mordvintsev*, 1997], V. Horobets [*Horobets*, 2007], which provide a historico-legal study of the Cossack Hetmanate. Another relevant study in the area is furnished by V. Lastovsky [*Lastovsky*, 2008] in his work dealing ecclesiastic historiographic aspects. This work reviews historical efforts focusing on the issue and linking it to the encroachment of the Russian authorities on the identity of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.

The object of this article is to describe the activities pursued by Ukrainian Ecclesiastic Missions to Russia in the period spanning from the second half of the 17th century to the early 18th century with the research being based on the materials supplied by the two major centres of spiritual and intellectual activities at the time, i.e. the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra and Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. These two entities enjoyed special privileges that had been thitherto granted, therefore, the major task to be pursued by these institutions in the face of Russian centralism was to retain the powers which were about diplomatic functions and ecclesiastic advocacy or protection of cloisters in their charge.

Major research material presentation.

Missions dispatched by the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra

As far as all Ukrainian cloisters concerned, the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra had the most acute need to protect its interests. The reason for this, on the hand, was its ownership of large landed estates and a great number of attached monasteries. Another factor for this state of things was a special status of the Monastery, i.e. the status of lavra¹, and right of stauropegia². Confronted with

¹ Lavras are monasteries with vast membership and attached monasteries. The Kyiv-Pechersk Monastery was officially awarded the lavra status and the right of stauropegia by the letter of 1592 granted by Jeremiah II, Patriarch of Constantinople.

² Stauropegic monasteries in the Orthodox Church were those that were immediately subordinated to the supreme ecclesiastical authority, usually to the Patriarch (before 1686 – to the Patriarch of Constantinople, from 1688 to 1720 – to the Patriarch of Moscow), from 1721 to 1786 – to the Synod's authority.

political instability, the Lavra-based archimandrites had to send a special delegation if they were to be ordained to the rank or if a new sovereign had ascended the throne. These delegations were to take with them books, icons and other gifts so that their previously granted charters would be approved for estate ownership and retention of traditional rights and privileges enjoyed by the Lavra.

The retention of old rights by the Lavra under Russian rule was a purpose of a special delegation headed by Hieromonk Cyril, Warden of St. Anthony's Caves. The delegation was sent from Kyiv in February 1669. Under the pretext of handing over to Russia's Tsar a newly-published book "Peace with God to Be Acquired by Man", written by Pechersk Archimandrite Innocent Giesel (Innokenty Gizel), which was allegedly to be promoted for distribution in Russia, the actual aim of the delegation was to make sure that the Lavra would remain under the jurisdiction of the Constantinople Patriarchate.

Aware of the importance of the planned mission, the forward-looking Rector of the Lavra made thorough preparations for this mission. Innocent Giesel had paid a visit to Vasily Sheremetev, Voivode of Kyiv and said to him that he was in no condition to go to Moscow and asked a leave to present his newly-published book "Peace with God to Be Acquired by Man" (1669) [1: 146]. On securing the permission, the Rector of the Lavra mounted a 14-strong delegation and gave them letters to be passed to the Tsar and the Patriarch. The latter was requested to support all the Lavra's petitions. Also, the Rector gave necessary instructions as to the actions towards accomplishing the task [Eingorn, 1899 : 603].

Ten days later, on arrival in Moscow in late March 1669, the delegation from the Lavra was granted an audience by the Tsar. At that audience, Cyril delivered a complimentary speech and handed to the Tsar a lavishly designed copy of the book by Innocent Giesel with the dedication from the author. Having prepared the Tsar for what they were, a fortnight later the Lavra's envoys passed him the petition from the Lavra, which included thirteen points. The main point was about the retention of the canonic jurisdiction under which the Lavra was at the time [1 : 134–135, 147–160]. It is noteworthy that this occurred when the Russian leaders, Boyar Orden-Naschokin in particular, were actively hatching up and implementing schemes for bringing all Ukrainian clergy under the Russian ecclesiastical protectorate [Eingorn, 1899 : 588–602]. Probably, opposed to being under Russian ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Innocent Giesel sought in this way to sway the plans of the Russian authorities.

Apart from the issue of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, Innocent Giesel's petition had other requests, including but not limited to exemption of the Lavra's clergy from the judiciary power of the voivode, exemption of the Lavra's liegemen from duty payment and quartering of soldiers and banning Kyiv citizen from using ferries, forests and hayfields owned by monasteries. By and large, the requests contained in the Lavra's petition were fully or partially satisfied. When the petition was being considered, Hieromonk Cyril had to provide a clarification on some question to the officials at the Little Russia Office [1 : 235–236; Eingorn, 1899 : 607–616]. As for the retention of the status of stauropagic monastery under the jurisdiction the Constantinople Patriarchate, the Tsar evaded the answer.

The Lavra's mission dispatched in 1669 was of great importance, both ecclesiastically and politically. Specifically, it made it clear to the Muscovite leadership that the Ukrainian clergy was opposed to the idea of Moscow's protectorate. This, in turn, led the Muscovites to relinquish plans by Boyar Orden-Naschokin to immediately bring the Kyiv Metropolitanate under their control.

The rectorship of Archimandrite Innocent Giesel saw another delegation from the Lavra sent to the capital of Russia. Organised in March 1680, this mission included members of the Ecclesiastic Council such as deputy rector St Barlaam (Varlaam Yasynsky), Paisios the Cave

Dweller, Warden of the Near Caves and Ivan Armashenko, a scribe [9, 1 : 112 r.; 8 : 336]. When in Moscow, they presented a petition as instructed by Innocent Giesel [8 : 336]. In response to this petition, in 1680 Tsar Theodore III submitted to the Lavra's authority the Cholnsk Monastery of the Saviour [7, p. 199–201] as well as some letters authorising the ownership of the town of Pechersk [*Evgeniy (Bolhovitinov)*, 1847 : 201–202], fishing ferries across the Dnipro river [7, p. 202–204], the Monastery Hospital of the Trinity [*Evgeniy (Bolhovitinov)*, 1847 : 204–205]. Also, he allowed the monastic elders residing in the Lavra to come to Moscow for offertory collections once in four years [*Evgeniy (Bolhovitinov)*, 1847 : 206–207]. The granting of all the requests stated in the petition was indicative of the mission's unqualified success, especially in the Ruin period. It took a near two-month stay in Moscow to accomplish this uphill task [10, 1 : 6–30; 8 : 337]. Later on, on April 17th 1688, St Barlaam wrote to Sophia, the Tsar's daughter, that the obtainment from Theodore III of the important letters was owing to his obedience also [10, 1 : 175].

It is worth citing an example illustrative of the Lavra's envoys carrying out another important mission. More than once did the last quarter of the 17th saw examples of the Lavra's leaders neglecting the Muscovite ecclesiastical authority. In particular, newly-elected Pechersk archimandrites sought to observe the ordination patterns traditionally practised in Ukraine. For example, the letter from Lazar Baranovych, Archbishop of Chernihiv, to Patriarch Joachim, dated June 11th 1684, was indicative of the fact that newly-elected Archimandrite Barlaam was ordained by the writer of the letter, but not by Moscow clergymen. Also, the letter stated that rather than going to Moscow himself, Lazar Baranovych dispatched envoys with the request for the letter authorising his ordination as Archimandrite. The mission entrusted to the envoys (John of Tobolsk (Ivan Maksymovych), Rector of the Novopechersk Svensk Monastery, Hieromonk Afanasii Myslavsky, Filaret Lynevych Rector of the Cholnsk Monastery of the Saviour and Havryil Filipovych, a scribe) [10, 1 : 114; 2 : 212–214] was a tall order given the Patriarch's displeasure with such disrespect. Of no help was the assistance from Lazar Baranovych – the Patriarch did not grant the letter of approval [8 : 362–363]. This prompted St Barlaam to write a new letter to the Patriarch in December 1684 and dispatch another mission, which was again headed by John of Tobolsk [2 : 217–219; 8 : 363]. Unlike the previous one, this mission proved successful. As a result, on February 26th 1685 the Patriarch of Moscow gave a written benediction for ordination of St Barlaam as Pechersk Archimandrite [2 : 222–225]. Thus, the assignments meant to secure the Monastery's powers were a challenging thing, as they did not always achieve ends.

The ownership of all estates by the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra was also acknowledged by Peter I (Peter the Great) in 1720, which was owing to joint efforts undertaken by the Monastery's leadership. Furthermore, the Tsar granted three letters dated October 16th in the name and for the benefit of Archimandrite Ioanykiy Senyutovych and the Monastery's fraternity. The first letter, which was of general nature, affirmed the Lavra's status as the patriarchal stauropegic monastery, whereas the second one listed all the documents certifying the Monastery's land ownership. As for the third letter, it specifically stated the ownership of the Monastery Hospital of the Trinity [*Titov*, 1913 : Appendix 18, 19, 20]. Because of the fire in 1718 the Lavra failed to provide the necessary documentary evidence, which is why Roman Kopa the Lavra's attorney, presented his own evidence in the form of the report and spoken testimony [*Evgeniy (Bolhovitinov)*, 1847: 266–268]. A comprehensive list of previously granted letters that were acknowledge by the detailed letter issued by the Tsar in 1720 are illustrative to thorough preparation carried out by the Lavra's envoys and the archimandrite, this having been done to obtain this important document.

As far as the ascent to power of Peter II was concerned, Kyiv's church elite identified it with their hopes to reclaim the rights and privileges of the Ukrainian Church. It is a known fact

that in 1728 Barlaam Vanatovych (Varlaam), Bishop of Kyiv, made official efforts to reclaim the status of the Kyiv Metropolitanate. Similar efforts to return the privileges via advocacy were undertaken by the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra.

To take advantage of the festivities marking the enthronement of Peter II, in 1727 the Lavra's leadership sent to Saint Petersburg a special delegation headed by Roman Kopa, who had broad experience of administrative legal assignments. The records stored in the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra's make it possible to retrace the circumstances of this challenging mission.

Roman Kopa, the Lavra's authorised representative, who came to hold an honorary office of Deputy Rector, was handed a detailed instruction with points to be pursued by the mission [22, 1 : 2–4 r.]. The 18 listed points were about the necessity to acknowledge the previously granted letters, as well as to seek the Lavra's exemption from all taxes and duties and compensation for the land which was confiscated in 1706 for building the defences. Forced to stay in the royal court for a long time, Roman Kopa took the opportunity to resolve other issues, censorship of the Lavra's publications included.

Roman Kopa regularly informed the Monastery's leadership on how things were developing and gave a detailed description of the imperial coronation ceremony, which was held on February 25th 1728 [22, 1 : 25, 32–32 r.]. Apart from that he reported how he had been awarded a commemorative token for this event [22, 1 : 35]. In fact, all the tasks stated in the Lavra's instruction were fulfilled except one regarding the compensation for the land that had been taken away in 1706 to supply space for the Pechersk Fortress. After that Roman Kopa went on to report about the completion of all tasks he had been entrusted with and the handover of responsibilities to Isaiah, a successive Lavra's attorney. Thus, Roman Kopa's efforts as attorney, which resulted in Peter II granting four imperial letters can be deemed fairly successful

Favourable for the Ukrainian Church, the rule of Peter II significantly contributed to the success of the mission undertaken by Inokentiy Zhdanovych, Rector of the Svensk Monastery, who also acted as the Lavra's attorney. He being assisted by Count Gavriil Golovkin, his trip to Moscow resulted in the granting of the letter by Peter II, dated June 10th 1729, which was issued in the name of Pechersk Archimandrite Inokentiy Zhdanovych. It authorised the latter's ordination and the supply of the equipment for Assumption Church, which had suffered a fire in 1718 [Titov, 1913 : Appendix 32].

As regards efforts by Isaiah, an attorney to whom Roman Kopa handed over responsibilities, he is known to have written a letter to Elizabeth, the emperor's daughter, in which he reminded her about the promise by Empress Catherine I, Elizabeth's mother, to provide the Lavra with funds for vestments [21: 3]. Thus, the Lavra's attorneys (Roman Kopa, Inokentiy Zhdanovych and Isaiah) contributed much effort towards the search for benefactors who would fund the restoration of the Assumption Cathedral and its equipment which had been destroyed by a 1718 fire.

Missions mounted to safeguard the rights of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

The Kyiv-Mohyla Academy had always attached great significance to the state's recognition of its legal status as an institution of higher learning. In his time, Petro Mohyla, Metropolitan of Kyiv, sought the obtainment of the corresponding letter from Polish King Vlidislav IV. Despite the fact that this privilege granted in March 1635 did legitimise Kyiv-based schools, it did not authorise them to provide upper-level courses such as philosophy and theology. In fact, the status of the higher learning institution was awarded by Hetman Ivan Vyhovsky, this having been enshrined in the Treaty of Hadiach of 1658. However, the Academy's status had been officially recognised.

When Ukraine came under Russian rule in the second half of the 17th century, the issue of the Academy's status as a higher learning institution again came to the fore. Now it had to be

tackled by the Russian government. The accomplishment of this task became a top priority for the Kyiv-based church leaders, the Academy's authorities and Kyiv bishops as the institution's patrons.

At the binning of 1670, St. Barlaam, Father Superior and Rector of the Brotherhood Monastery, dispatched a delegation to bring to Russian Tsar Alexis I a petition which provided details about the institution's financial state and legal status, the latter being based on the Tsar's letter of August 30th 1650. This letter allowed the monastery's inhabitants to come Moscow for alms. The 7-strong mission from the Brotherhood Monastery headed by Victor Gilevsky, a prefect and lecturer, was to follow the instruction by the Monastery's Rector [8: 314]. To enhance the petition, St Barlaam supplied the mission with letters of recommendation given by the Hetman, Lazar Baranovych, Archbishop of Chernihiv and Novhorod-Siverskyi, and Patriarch Paisios of Alexandria, who was on a visit to Kyiv in September 1669. It is noteworthy that this effort was joined by the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra. The Lavra's Archimandrite Innocent Giesel (past Rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy) attached his epistle to the Tsar, which was to the effect that Metropolitan Petro Mohyla bequeathed him to take care of schools at the Epiphany Brotherhood Monastery [*Eingorn*, 1899 : 676].

One of the points in the petition was about the legal recognition of Kyiv-based schools [*Eingorn*, 1899 : 683]. The other points contained the requests to improve the financial state of the Monastery. For all that, the responses to all those requests had it that they should take the matter to the Hetman [*Eingorn*, 1899 : 683]. The Tsar's indifference and apathy to St Barlaam's petition was not swayed even by the fact that the head of the mission acting on the instruction of the Father Superior was to hand the Tsar several copies of the book "A Key to Understanding" donated to the monastery by the author Ioannikiy Galyatovsky. As a consequence, of all the points contained in the petition, only one was satisfied. This one was about assigning the Church of Three Saints to the Brotherhood Monastery. It is to be assumed that the failure of Kyiv's mission could be accounted for by a negative attitude of the imperial court to St. Barlaam for the political views he held.

The canonical subordination of the Kyiv Metropolitanate to the Patriarchate of Moscow created further opportunities for affirming the Kyiv Mohyla Academy's legal and financial status and galvanised the institution's authorities into action towards this end. In the year 1691, backed by St Barlaam, Pakhomiy Pidluzky, Rector of the Academy, sent to Moscow a mission made up of several lecturers and students and headed by Syluan Ozersky, a prefect and professor of philosophy. As stated in Patriarch Adrian's letter to Hetman Ivan Mazepa (September 1691), the delegation included a nephew of Hetman Ivan Obydovsky [2 : 310–311]. The task of the delegation was to present the petition for acknowledgment of legal and property rights to be enjoyed by the Academy. To secure friendly attitudes on the part of joint Tsars Ivan V and Peter I, the Ukrainians presented them with a lavish eulogy [*Petrov*, 1895 : 51]. For more authority, the delegation was supplied with a letter by Hetman Ivan Mazepa, dated August 4th 1691 p. [*Golubev*, 1888 : 17].

For all that, Syluan Ozersky's mission was protracted, and the leaders of the Brotherhood Monastery went on to form a new delegation. This time in June 1693 Ioasaf Krakovsky, a new Rector of Kyiv College, was dispatched to Moscow in propria persona by Kyiv Metropolitan Barlaam with the backing of Hetman Ivan Mazepa being provided. Ioasaf Krakovsky was tasked to present the new petition seeking the obtainment of the Tsar's letter for the Brotherhood Monastery and donations for the school [10, 1 : 131 r.; 15 : 475].

On July 10th 1693, Ioasaf Krakovsky delivered a complimentary speech to the Tsar and handed him a letter from and gifts from Metropolitan Barlaam. The gift items were a cypress cross, the icon of St. Volodymyr and printed eulogistic poetry featuring the Passion [8 : 811].

The trip made by Ioasaf Krakovsky proved to be a success – on January 11th 1694, the Academy was granted two Tsar's letters certifying estate ownership and the right to teach not only poetics and oratory, but philosophy and theology as well. Moreover, it allowed the enrolment of students from other countries [15, No 35, 36].

But resentment and verbal assaults against the Academy by Kyiv's townsfolk prompted the leadership of the Kyiv Metropolitanate to seek the obtainment of another letter to confirm the first two letters and to protect the rights of the Academy. A delegation with Hieromonk John ((Ioann) and two monks from the Brotherhood Monastery resulted in the letter being granted by Peter I on September 26th 1701. The letter was issued in the name of the then Rector Prokopiyy Kolachynsky [15 : 493]. When handling the issue, he obtained support from Stefan Yavorsky, Deputy Patriarch and Metropolitan of Ryazan. Apart from the acknowledgment of previously obtained rights, the Academy was awarded the judicial autonomy. This spelled recognition of the Academy as a fully-fledged institution of higher learning. From that time on, the name "Kyiv Academy" gained wide currency. Therefore, advocacy powers of the Ukrainian clergy coupled with influential support were highly warranted because they were critical to the missions' tangible success.

Conclusions. Thus, the efforts by the Ukrainian ecclesiastical missions dispatched to Russia in the period from the second half of the 17th Century to the early 18th century were of great significance to the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. Special monastery powers used in the context of Russian centralism served the purpose of ecclesiastic advocacy and protection of the rights to be exercised by cloisters.

Thanks to a sophisticated education background and organisational and diplomatic talent, the Ukrainian envoys were able to achieve significant success and to protect the interests of Kyiv's ecclesiastic and intellectual centres, i.e. the retention by the Pechersk Monastery of the Lavra status and securing by the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy of the status as a higher learning institution.

Of great ecclesiastic and political importance were the missions dispatched by the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra in 1669. They awoke the Russian leadership to the fact of the Ukrainian clergy being opposed to the idea of the Russian protectorate. Due to this, the moves to immediately subordinate the Kyiv Metropolitanate were postponed for another 20 years.

References

1. *Akty Yuzhnoy i Zapadnoy Rossii, sobrannyye i izdannyye Arheograficheskoy komissiiy* (1873) [Acts of South and Western Russia, collected and published by the Archaeological Commission], 8, Sankt-Peterburg, 10, 400, 23 p.
2. *Arhiv Yugo-Zapadnoy Rossii, izdavaemyy Komissiiy dlya razbora drevnih aktov* (1872) [Archive of South-Western Russia, published by the Commission for the analysis of ancient acts], 1, 5, Kyiv, 666 p.
3. *Golubev S. T.* (1900) 'Gedeon Odorskiy, byivshiy rektor Kyivskoy Akademii v nachale XVIII v.' [Gedeon Odorsky, former rector of the Kyiv Academy at the beginning of the XVIII century], *Trudyi Kyivskoy duhovnoy akademii*, 12, P. 567–627.
4. *Golubev S. T.* (1888) 'Istoriya Kyivskoy Duhovnoy Akademii. Vypusk pervyyi. Period domogilyanskiy' [Golubev S. T. History of the Kyiv Theological Academy. – Issue the first. The period of dohohylyansky], Kyiv, 233, 117 p.
5. *Golubev S. T.* (1901) 'Kyivskaya Akademiya v kontse XVII – nachale XVIII stoletiy' [Kyiv Academy in the late XVII early XVIII centuries], Kyiv, 111 p.

6. *Horobets V.* (2007). '«Volymo tsaria shidnoho...». Ukrainskyi Hetmanat ta rosijska dynastia do i pislia Pereiaslava' [Gorobets V. Ukrainian Hetmanate and Russian dynasty before and after Pereiaslav], Kyiv: Krytyka, 464 p.
7. *Evgeniy (Bolhovitinov)* (1847) 'Opisanie Kyivo-Pecherskoy Lavryi s prisovokupleniem raznyih gramot i vipisok' [Evgeny (Bolkhovitinov). Description of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra with the addition of various letters and extracts], Kyiv, 340 p.
8. *Iz proshlogo Kyivskoy eparhii. Kyivskiy mitropolit Varlaam Yasinskiy* (1905) [From the past of the Kyiv diocese. Kyiv Metropolitan Varlaam Yasinsky], *Kyivskie eparhialnie vedomosti*, Chast neofitsialnaya, 12–49, P. 286–289...1268–1273.
9. *Instytut rukopysu Nationalnoji Biblioteky imeni V. I. Vernadskogo* [Institute of Manuscript of the V. I. Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine], fond 312, № 430, I, 139 p.
10. *Instytut rukopysu Nationalnoji Biblioteky imeni V. I. Vernadskogo* [Institute of Manuscript of the V. I. Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine], fond 312, № 430, II, 189 p.
11. *Kagamlyk S. R.* (2005) 'Kyievo-Pecherska lavra: svit pravoslavnoi dukhovnosti i kultury (XVII – XVIII st.)' [Kyiv Pechersk Lavra: the world of Orthodox spirituality and culture], *Natsionalnyi Kyivo-Pecherskyi istoriko-kulturnyi zapovidnyk*, 552 p.
12. *Kohut Z.* (1996) 'Rosijskyi tsentralizm i ukrainska avtonomiia. Likvidatsiia Hetmanshchyny. 1760–1830' [Russian centralism and Ukrainian autonomy. Liquidation of the Hetmanate], Kyiv: Osnovy, 317 p.
13. *Lastovsky V. V.* (2008). 'Mizh suspilstvom i derzhavoiu. Pravoslavna tserkva v Ukraini naprykintsi XVII – u XVIII st. v istorii ta istoriografii' [Between society and the state. Orthodox Church in Ukraine in the late XVII – XVIII centuries. in history and historiography], Kyiv : Feniks, 496 p.
14. *Mordvintsev V. M.* (1997). 'Rosijiske samoderzhavstvo i Ukrainska pravoslavna tserkva v kintsi XVII–XVIII st.' [Russian Autocracy and the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the late XVII], Kyiv: VPTS «Kyivskij universitet», 95 p.
15. *Pamyatniki Kyivskoy Komissii dlya razbora drevnih aktov* (1898) [Monuments of the Kyiv Commission for the analysis of ancient acts], II, Kyiv, 617 p.
16. *Petrov N. I.* (1895) 'Kyivskaya Akademiya vo vtoroy polovine XVII v.' [Kyiv Academy in the second half of the XVII century], Kyiv, 177 p.
17. *Plohiy S.* (2006) 'Kozatstvo i relihiia v rannomodernii Ukraini' [Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine], Kyiv: Krytyka, 495 p.
18. *Titov F. I.* (1913) 'Russkij tsarstvujuchij dom Romanovyh v otnoshenii ego k Kyivo-Pecherskoj Lavre' [Russian royal house of the Romanovs in relation to him to the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra], Kyiv, 173 p.
19. *Kharlampovich K.* (1914) 'Malorossijskoe vlijanie na velikorusckuju cerkovnuju zhizn' [Little Russian influence on Great Russian church life], I, Kazan, 970 p.
20. *Centralnyi derzhavnyj istorychnyj arhiv Ukrainy, Kyiv* [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv], fond 128, opys 1 zahalnyi, sprava 7, 5 ark.
21. *Centralnyi derzhavnyj istorychnyj arhiv Ukrainy, Kyiv* [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv], fond 128, opys 1 zahalnyi, sprava 8, 3 ark.
22. *Centralnyi derzhavnyj istorychnyj arhiv Ukrainy, Kyiv* [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv], fond 128, opys 2 chernetskyi, sprava 4, 48 ark.
23. *Eingorn V.* (1899) 'Snosheniya malorusckogo duhovenstva s moskovskim pravitelstvom v epohu tsarstvovaniya Alekseya Mihaylovicha' [Relations of the Little Russian clergy with the Moscow government in the era of the reign of Alexey Mikhailovich], Moskva, 1104 p.