Abstract. The purpose of the article – on the basis of newly discovered archival materials, to analyze the complex conditions of book publishing activity of Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra of the second half of the XVIIIth century under pressure from the censorship of the Russian imperial authorities, which led to the ultimate loss of independence of Lavra printing press. The Novelty of the Research. The main source of the research is a non-updated correspondence of the special authorized persons from Lavra monastic fraternity with the rector of Pechersk monastery, who were entrusted with various important cases of a legal, economic, educational character, in particular, to assert the independence of Pechersk printing. The Methodology of the Research. In the article the method of intellectual networks modelling, which gives an opportunity to look at the Ukrainian cultural world as a structure of intellectual networks, has been used on the materials of the correspondence. The Conclusions. Thus, the newly discovered archival materials attest to the censorship of the Russian imperial power, which sought to deprive finally Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra of its opposition and originality in book publishing. In order to preserve the ancient freedom of the press, the monastery's management sent to the capital cities of the Russian Empire special authorized persons, who performed the functions of monastic lawyers. The letters of Lavra commissioners to Pechersk Archimandrite Zoym Valkevych attest to their efforts to defend the independence of Lavra printing, in which, however, they could not succeed under conditions of the Russian centralism under the rule of Catherine II. By the act of secularization of the monastery lands in 1786, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra was subordinated to the direct care of the Metropolitan of Kyiv, to whom the Synod transferred all control over printing in Lavra printing house. In this way, Lavra lost its main right of stauropegia, and Pechersk printing house finally lost its independence in book publishing.
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How Moscow colonized Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra. New pages to the history of the Ukrainian printing...

ЯК МОСКВА КОЛОНІЗУВАЛА КИЄВО-ПЕЧЕРСЬКУ ЛАВРУ.
НОВІ СТОРІНКИ ДО ІСТОРІЇ УКРАЇНСЬКОГО ДРУКАРСТВА
ДРУГОЇ ПОЛОВINИ XVIII СТ.

Анотація. Мета дослідження: У статті ставиться за мету проаналізувати складні умови книговидавничої діяльності Києво-Печерської лаври другої половини XVIII ст. під тиском цензури російської імперської влади, що призвело до остаточної втрати незалежності лаврського друкарства. Джерела і новизна: Головним джерелом дослідження є неактуалізоване листування з настоятелем Печерського монастиря спеціальних уповноважених осіб із лаврської чернечої братії, яким доручались різні важливі справи юридичного, господарського, просвітницького та іншого характеру, зокрема, відстоявання незалежності печерського друкарства. Методологія: У статті на матеріалах листування застосовано метод моделювання інтелектуальних мереж, який дає можливість поглянути на український культурний світ як структуру інтелектуальних мереж. Висновки. Нововиявлени архівні матеріали ЦДІАК України засвідчують цензурні утилізи російських властей, які намагались остаточно позбавити Києво-Печерську лавру її опозиційності та самобутності у книговидавничій діяльності. Наведені листи лаврських повірених до Печерського архимандрита Зосима Валькевич заохочують їхні зусилля відстояти незалежність лаврського книгодрукування, які, проте, не можливо досягнути успіху в умовах російського централізму. Ключові слова: Православна Церква, Києво-Печерська лавра, українське друкарство, Печерська друкарня, російська імперська влада.

The Problem Statement. During the 1990-ies, the first decade of the XXIst century a number of scientific studies appeared in the history science, illustrating various spheres of the Orthodox Church activity in Ukraine – church political, spiritual religious, cultural educational; the works that focus on the activity of both individual institutions and church biography. One of the most topical in this area there was the problem of defending the rights and interests of the Orthodox Church in connection with the subordination of Kyiv Metropolitanate to Moscow Patriarchate in 1686, which gains a special topicality nowadays in the context of the Russian military and information aggression. The materials of Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra Fund, which testify to the tense conditions of Pechersk printing house under conditions of the onset of the Russian centralism, are illustrated in this context.

The Analysis of Recent Researches and Publications. The history of Ukrainian printing, including book printing in Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, thanks to the works of P. Trotsky, F. Titov, S. Maslov, I. Kahanov, I. Ohienko, J. Isaievych, D. Stepovyk and other scientists, belongs to the sphere of well-studied aspects of a national culture (Trotsky, 1865; Titov, 1916; Maslov, 1925; Kahanov, 1959; Ohienko, 1994; Stepovyk, 2001; Isaievych, 2002). Describing the complex conditions of Pechersk printing house in the XVIIIth century, the researchers mainly singled out the notorious decree of 1720 of Peter I, which deprived Kiev-Pechersk Lavra of the ancient freedom of the press. Less attention was paid to these works during the second half of the XVIIIth century, when after the favourable reign of Empress Elizabeth for Ukraine, there came the reign of Catherine II, a fatal one in all respects for the Ukrainian statehood and the Church.
A thorough analysis of Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra Fund materials in the process of preparation a personal monograph by the author of this article on the history of a cultural and educational activity of the monastery of the XVIIth – XVIIIth centuries gave reason to think that in this sphere there will no longer be something unexpected (Kagamlyk, 2005). However, in the course of further work with the Fund materials on other studies, interesting documents were found out, which reveal the problems that arose in the activity of Pechersk printing press in the 60-ies – in the early 70-ies of the XVIIIth century.

**The purpose of the article** – on the basis of newly discovered archival materials, to analyze the complex conditions of book publishing activity of Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra of the second half of the XVIIIth century under pressure from the censorship of the Russian imperial authorities, which led to the ultimate loss of independence of Lavra printing press.

**The Statement of the Basic Material.** Unique in volume (more than 30 000 cases, which exceeds the volume of the rest of the monastic foundations of the CSIAK of Ukraine taken totally), unique in a structural construction (11 separate structural units) and multifaceted information Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra Fund materials were researched, although fragmentally, by F. Titov, D. Vyshevsky, P. Trotsky, Yu. Lebedyntsev, P. Zholtovsky, V. Shydenko, V. Mordvintsev during various periods of time. At the same time, a considerable layer of documents remained beyond the researchers’ attention. It concerns the printing part of the fund, which, in addition to well-researched materials on the organization of printing production in the monastery, the circumstances of individual publications printing, the forms of their distribution, etc., postponed the correspondence of ecclesiastical figures from Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra fraternity, became the main source, used by us in this article.

In one of the latest author’s publications, the importance of a thorough study of the epistolary heritage of Ukrainian ecclesiastical elite of the XVIIth – XVIIIth centuries was emphasized. The epistolary heritage of Ukrainian ecclesiastical elite of the XVIIth – XVIIIth centuries reveals the diversity of cultural relationships and the peculiarities of functioning of “mohylianskooho intellectual space” (Kagamlyk, 2018).

It is worth noting that, using the method of intellectual networks modelling, which gives an opportunity to look at the Ukrainian cultural world as a structure of intellectual networks, modern researchers developed the idea of intellectual communities functioning as a means of legitimizing the cultural history of Ukraine (Kolesnyk, 2008). In particular, L. Posokova adapted this method to the activity of the Orthodox colleges as separate intellectual units (Posokhova, 2011). Similarly, this method can be applied to Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra as a separate intellectual environment, on the basis of which the Ukrainian church and secular elite united (Kagamlyk, 2006). According to our observations, one-third of the bishops and abbots of the Ukrainian and Russian monasteries finished the monastic ascension school in Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (Kagamlyk, 2005, pp. 166–168). Taking advantage of its high status, the dignitaries of Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra fraternity favoured their native monastery in solving its particular issues, including those, related to publishing activity.

This article deals with the correspondence of special authorized persons who, after their monastic celibacy in Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, reached certain administrative positions in the monastery or outside it. These persons, named in the documents by Lavra representatives, actually performed the functions of monastic attorneys in the territory of the metropolitan cities of the Russian Empire, who were entrusted with various important cases of a legal, economic, educational character, in particular, to defend the independence of Pechersk publishing, or at least easing the pressure of Moscow censorship.
We outline briefly the prerequisites for the processes discussed in this publication. With the subordination of Lavra to Moscow Patriarch on stauropegia rights in 1688, the issue of freedom of the press of Pechersk printing was raised. The imperial diploma for stauropegia demanded that Lavra should have mentioned the tsar and the patriarch in the printed books (Bolhovitinov, 1826, p. 224).

Formally agreeing to send the book to the patriarch for a previous review, Lavra in its printing activities tried to avoid a clerical censorship. Meletius Vuyakhevych, Pechersk Archimandrite, using the influential support of Hetman Ivan Mazepa, openly defended Lavra's independence in printing. In 1692, without the consent of Patriarch, the Liturgy text book was printed, in the preface of which, Lavra did not specify the names of Moscow tsars and Patriarch Adrian. This fact caused a violent dissatisfaction of Patriarch Adrian (Arhiv Yugo-Zapadnoi Rossii, 1872, p. 359; Ohienko, 1994, p. 289). In response, Meletius Vuyakhevych, stating that printing gives Lavra a basic income, requested Moscow Patriarch for permission to continue printing books without a prior consideration and review. However, the top Russian hierarch, although he apologized Meletius’s “omission”, still insisted on agreeing with him printing of all the books in Lavra (Kagamlyk, 2005, p. 203).

Released on October 5, in 1720 Decree of Peter I caused a number of restrictions on Lavra, which previously enjoyed the freedom of printing. The requirements of the Russian authorities – a full correspondence with the books of the Russian press, obtaining permission to print each individual book, sending signal copies of books for a preliminary consideration of the Synod – made it necessary for the administration of the monastery to choose special authorized persons, whose activities were to be directed to facilitate the control over Lavra printing.

In December 1726, Lavra authorities asked the Synod for permission to print books “at the request of Malorosiyskoho and foreign Orthodox peoples” for a pray in a cell. In response,
the Synod reminded of the need for a full correspondence of the press with similar Russian editions and demanded two copies of the newly printed editions (Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv – CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 6, p. 2). Therefore, in 1727 Lavra’s authorities sent to St. Petersburg a special commissioner – Isaiah, a Hieromonk of Trubchevsky Cholnsky Monastery, instructing him to seek for easing the control over Lavra printing. Lavra’s commissioner presented 2 copies of the newly published “New Testament” in 1725 to the Synod and requested for the approval of the book for sale. The petition of Lavra’s representative was successful: the Synod, by decree of November 29, 1727, allowed the sale of this and other books printed in accordance with Moscow models, taking into account the fact that the Synod had no unnecessary troubles, and the monastery – unnecessary expenses and troubles (Opisanie dokumentov i del, 1885, № 327). The responsibility for printing books was entrusted to Pechersk Archimandrite, who had to check the newly printed books thoroughly (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 105, p. 3).

Next year, in 1728, another commissioner – Lavra’s governor, Roman Copa, applied for permission to print and sell books by Lavra that had previously been published in Pechersk printing house and had no Moscow analogues, such as the Prayer books and Akathists, which had been published in Kyiv (Opisanie dokumentov i del, 1885, № 327). In response to this petition, Decree of the Synod of February 21, 1728 was issued, which allowed to print these books on condition that there were no “oppositions” in them (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 105, p. 4; Opisanie dokumentov i del, 1885, № 327). Thus, Lavra commissioners succeeded in their work – they managed to achieve censorship relief over the book publishing of Pechersk printing house, though temporarily.

However, with the reign of Catherine II, new pressures began on the language and spelling peculiarities of Lavra book publishing. On November 6, 1766 the Synod, noting that since 1728 Kyiv and Chernihiv printing houses did not send any books for the review, forbade printing of any new books, and previous editions always had to be checked with the Russian ones to eliminate any language differences (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 105, p. 2). After the publication of “The New Testament” book, the Russian authorities were instructed to send to the Synod a register of books, printed in Pechersk printing house, indicating the time of publication, who allowed to print a book, and to submit the copies of the books. This threatened the printing press with a ban on the sale of these books and could cause large losses. Therefore, Lavra authorities decided to involve several commissioners in this case. Thus, in March 1767, Antony Sumnetsky, was sent to Moscow with a command mainly to seek for some relief from the censorship of Lavra printing, though he was also charged with solving other matters (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 105, pp. 86–88). In the letter, dated from April 12, 1767, A. Sumnetsky reported that the employees of Moscow synodal printing house reviewed the books, printed in Lavra, with a special attention, “with passion” (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 105, pp. 115–115 ret.). In another letter he added that the case could not be changed for the better (CSHAUK, f. 128, d.1 drukarskyi, c. 105, p. 119). Another commissioner Iov, a hieromonk, was instructed by Spiritual assembly of Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra to provide information on the possible decision of the Synod in this case (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 108, p. 15). Despite the unfavourable circumstances and the worsening attitude towards Lavra by the members of the Synod, in which there were virtually no Ukrainians, the commissioners facilitated the adoption of the decree, which authorized the sale of books that were blacklisted, but on condition to continue printing these and other books, which were not published in Moscow printing house, as if the books had
been previously published. Thus, dissatisfaction of Moscow authorities was mainly due to the fact that Lavra tried to avoid censorship and represented the publication of new books in the guise of reprinting the old ones, which was revealed by the synodal reviewers.

Despite the active activity of Lavra commissioners, the “black clouds” over Pechersk printing house became even more dense. In 1767, the Synod found “errors” (differences from Moscow analogues) in the newly published by Lavra “Oktoikh” and “Psalms” (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 108, 109; RSHA, f. 796, d. 48, c. 545; Opisanie dokumentov i del, 1915, № 191). In 1769, the “defective” were the publication of “The Six Days” and “The Bible”, which resulted in a new decree of the Synod with threats of fine and increase in the number of reviewers of printing samples (CSHAUK, f. 128, d.1 drukarskyi, c. 161). In this regard, in January 1770, Zosyma Valkevych, Pechersk Archimandrite, appealed to Lavra commissioner in Moscow, Joseph Tymoshevych, Archimandrite of Moscow Zlatoust Monastery, so that he would investigate the situation concerning Lavra printings and send the copies of the correspondent documents to protect Lavra from possible troubles. In response, J. Tymoshevych wrote that he had made every effort to fulfill this request, but because “the discrepancies were written out in over two hundred notebooks”, he only partially succeeded in writing out “the errors” from “The Six Days”, which he managed to identify with great effort (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 161, pp. 4–5).

Another commissioner of Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra, Varlaam Baranovych, who in 1772 substituted J. Tymoshevych as a rector of Moscow Zlatoust Monastery, was also involved in easing the control of Lavra book publishing. In his letter to Lavra of July 30, 1772 it is shown that, on behalf of the Spiritual assembly, he had to make an acquaintance with A. I. Pelsky, the director of Moscow synodal printing office, in order to speed up the review of Lavra books (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 zagalnyi, c. 350, pp. 12–13).

How difficult the situation was at that time for Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra and the activities of its commissioners it is evidenced with the letter dated February 18, 1770, from one of them, Ahhei Kolosovsky, who was appointed the legislator of the Naval Noble Corps in St. Petersburg. Noting that the “mistakes”, made in the Bible printing, were very dangerous for Lavra at that time, Lavra commissioner informed Archimandrite Zosym Valkevych that in this connection Archbishop of Moscow and Sevsky and a member of the Synod of the Russians, Platon Levshin, “had a quarrel with him”. In particular, the bishop mentioned that he had found 468 mistakes in the Bible, which he marked personally, and that the monks of Lavra should be “punished well” for being warned repeatedly, but they “intentionally printed texts different from Moscow copies” (CSHAUK, f. 128, d. 1 drukarskyi, c. 161, p. 10).

The warnings of the danger that hung over Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra with its printing house, which sounded in the letters of Lavra’s commissioners, were quite reasonable. Empress Catherine II, when preparing the act of secularization, intended to sweep away the Ukrainian Orthodox Church. The endless series of censorship decrees of the Synod lasted until 1786. Thus, in 1775, the Synod ordered Lavra to pay the employees of Moscow synodal printing house for checking the books, printed in Lavra, and beginning with 1783 – to send the information of the printed books annually (Kagamlyk, 2005, p. 214).

The censorship pressure concerning Pechersk publishing also affected the fate of Lavra's rector Zosym Valkevych, who, with the help of his proxies, consistently fought for the independence of Lavra printing. After the secularization of the monastery lands (1786) and the conversion of Lavra into a regular monastery, Zosym Valkevych was deprived of his duties as the abbot and sent to Holosiivska Pustyn’ – a third-class monastery, where he was
given a direct leadership. The last freely elected Pechersk Archimandrite “died in Holosiiv Pustyn’ being fired because of blindness” (Kagamlyk, 2005, p. 295).

By the act of 1786, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra was subordinated to the direct care of Samuel Myslavsky, Kyiv Metropolitan, who at the same time became its rector in the rank of archimandrite. He was entrusted with a direct care of Pechersk printing house. As a result, Lavra lost its primary right of stauropegia, and Pechersk printing house finally lost its independence in book publishing. According to I. Ohienko, “the old All-Ukrainian Academy, which worked so vigorously for the spiritual benefit of its people”, gradually became a branch of Moscow synodal printing house (Ohienko, 1994, p. 311).

The Conclusions. Thus, the newly discovered archival materials attest to the censorship of the Russian imperial power, which sought to deprive finally Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra of its opposition and originality in book publishing. In order to preserve the ancient freedom of the press, the monastery’s management sent to the capital cities of the Russian Empire special authorized persons, who performed the functions of monastic lawyers. The letters of Lavra commissioners to Pechersk Archimandrite Zosym Valkevych attest to their efforts to defend the independence of Lavra printing, in which, however, they could not succeed under conditions of the Russian centralism under the rule of Catherine II.

By the act of secularization of the monastery lands in 1786, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra was subordinated to the direct care of the Metropolitan of Kyiv, to whom the Synod transferred all control over printing in Lavra printing house. In this way, Lavra lost its main right of stauropegia, and Pechersk printing house finally lost its independence in book publishing.

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 documents

1767 р., 12 квітня, м. Москва. - Лист блюстителя Ближніх печер Антонія Сумнецького до Печерського архімандрита Зосими Валкевича у справі цензури лаврського друку

Ясне в Богу високопреподобнѣйшій господине, высокомилостивій господине отче и пастырю!

Три ордери, марта от 24 з Лавры отпущенніе, сего априля 6 числа чрез кієвского рейтарина Клименова мною получены, на которое в покорности моей доношу: По 1-му: газеты, каковы сего года вышли, всѣ оніе при сем посылаются, а чтоб в сей год в Лавру отпущены были, для того в здешней книжной лавкѣ я записался. По 2-му: о Іпатіевских деньгах возможно старательство прилагается и коллегія услужить желает, да просто не отваживается, а сискует благопристойных мѣр потерпѣть до времени совѣтует. По 3-му: вседушно раднѣйшій бы я в удоволствіе святой Лавры полную, как прошеніе гласит, о книгах резолюцію получить, да что дѣлать, книжніе немаліе погрѣшности способы заграждают, смотрѣть ужас ошибки каковы. Святѣйшій Синод опредѣленіе учинил, что печатать против московских книги, по оному и исполненіе навсегда чинить повелѣвает, а виступив с опредѣленія оного ниже думает, милость несказанна, что не штрафуют, да прежніе продавать не дозволяют, а прозбу, чтоб по прежнему печатать, и лишать не хотят, дозволніе дают какіе хотя величиною книги печатаются болшіе, средніе, маліе, или меншіе, да токмо в оних то класть, что
в осковских больших либо малых положено, а что в оних нет, то отнюдь не вносить, для того те лаврские книги [арк. 119 зв.] против московского переследовать и велено, что б по тому переследованню что явится сверхное и в московских небывалое выбросить. И сего синодального намерения да и учиненного уже определения переломить отнюдь невозможно. Переследование оное книг продолжится, как з обстоятельств видно, немалое время может, и чтоб мнѣ напрасно не изживаться великоновгородскому преосвященному в сходство имѣемой быть по смотру резолюцион при партикулярном своем письменном видѣ в Лавру отпускает, с комъ отпуском по просуи по его велѣнію я и всѣхъ намѣрен, на что и вашей святѣйшѣ паствырскаго благословения прошу. Сего апреля 11 числа еще три ордера получил я з лавры марта от 7 дня пущеніе, причем ящикъ зандокъ в дванадцати небольших слойкахъ принял, и на онѣ доншо нижайше: 1. В трастную среду з отцемъ духовникомъ по литургіи Ея імператорскому величеству и Его высочеству я былъ представленъ, поздравленіе ему учинилъ и при томъ воскресенье канонники поднеслъ, за что ея величество и его высочество удовольствій своѣ оказати соизволили. 2. Інокентіевы непорядочніи поступки и противности великнзовгородскому преосвященному мною довольно внушены, изволилъ сказать то ж, что и въ Лаврѣ объ немъ определено, сослатъ на комору въ приписній какой монастырь, а именно вговорилъ Омбицкій, [арк. 120] а когда онъ оттоль побежитъ, нужди нѣтъ, буди сюда явится, то де похватится, его непорядочства и воровство вѣдаетъ. 3. О Владимировской церквѣ, что не строить и парохію къ Вознесенской по прежнему причислить въ волѣ де отца архимандрита состоитъ, а чаятелно, что і парохіане о устройки новой церкви усиливат не станутъ. 4. Синіе краски долженъ буду купить и з собою привезти імѣю, а нинѣ высокоотеческой паствырской милости препоручив себя остаюсь. Ясне в Богу высокопреподобія Вашего высокомилостивого господина отца и пастіря всепокорнѣйшѣй послушник іеромонахъ Антоній Априля 12 1767 года Москва. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv, f. 128, d.1 drukarskyi, c. 105, pp. 119–120.
никакой власти; да и со всѣм моим старательством не мог я от присутствующих, которые суть и пріятели мои, и спросить того, чтоб оные ошибки мнѣ были и показаны, а объявлен только мнѣ указ Святѣйшаго Синода, по которому дѣлается изслѣдованіе и почти уже приведено ко окончанію и упователно в скорости будет в Святѣйшій Синод отослано. Я по искренности моей Вашему высокопреображенію представляю, что сіе по важности своей не должно касаться вообще [арк. 4 зв.] до Лавры, но и до нѣкоторых за несмотрѣніе персона, а дабы Ваше высокопреображеніе могли и в том удостовѣриться, то сообщаю при сем с одного того Шестодневника выписанныя ошибки, которые я достал с великою нуждою и тайнію. Из оных, а особливо из касающихся до титула, можете Ваше высокопреображеніе усмотрѣть, какое сіе дѣло требует от вас вниманія и старанія. В дополненіе ж того слышно, что таких же несходств выписано болѣе двух сот тетрадей из привезенных отцем Антоніем Сумицким книг, из коих и иниче по давности лѣт одной только Лаврѣ вообще, а иниче новѣйшіе и персонально могут быть опасны, впрочем одно благоразсудженіе Вашего высокопреподобія со всѣм обществом да отвратит всякое нещастіе. А я со усердіем моим и истинным высокопочитаніем пребываю

Вашего высокопреображенія, милостиваго моего господина, отца и благодѣтеля покорный слуга Іосиф, архимандрит Златоустовскій

Генваря 31 дня 1770 года.

Из Москвы.
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1770 р., лютого 18, Санкт-Петербург. - Лист адвоката Києво-Печерської лаври, законовчителя Санкт-Петербургського морського шляхетного корпусу Аггея Колосовського до Печерського архімандрита Зосими Валкевича у справі цензури лаврського друку

Ясне в Богу высокопреображеній господин отец архимандрит!

Милостивый мой отец и благодѣтель!

От 12 генваря почтеннѣйшее Вашей святыни писмо и предписаныя отцу Златоустовскому архимандриту для пересилки ко мнѣ сто рублей денег я 2 дня февраля имѣл честь получить, но водки на онѣ не покупал и не подносил, как потому что от Вашей святыни ничего к членам о том не писано, без какого выда никто ничего и пріимет, так и для того, что недавно пред сим подносил им присланныя от Лавры заидачи, которых также нѣкоторыя принимать не хотѣли. Хотя и писано об них, и я представлял, что Лавра из своих садов всѣгда имѣт фрукты. Повѣрьте, что весма здѣсь берегутся от взятков не только в духовных, но и в мирских, однако опослѣ при подносѣ седмичников отважусь поднести и водку, и мнѣ кажется пристойно при таком праздникѣ поздравить их, и презентом сим от Лавры свидѣтельствовать пожелание. Вашу же святиню прошу, ежели заблагоразсудите, за получением сего немедля прислать к членам поздравительныя о праздникѣ Пасхи или отвѣтные на посланные [арк. 9 зв.] от их преосвященств чрез нарочного куріера писма, и в них вложить хотя [бы] цѣдулки о водкѣ. Иначе бо сумнительно, чтоб была принята, и опасаюсь, чтоб не пропал кошт лаврскій. Удивляюсь, что мои письма, как цѣдулкою обявлять изволите, и по сие время не получены в Лаврѣ. И сердечно
исповеди изо многого важного и Лаврѣ нужного. Писал
да и чрез надежные, кажется, оказіи послал. На сих днях получен в Синодѣ из
Московской типографіи реестр з сообщеніем нашедшихся в лаврском шестодневѣ ошибок, за наступившею масляною и первою недѣлею поста ничего еще по оному
не послѣдовало и в представленіи не было. Я тѣх ошибок имѣю у себе копіи, подлинно ошибки, сколь в разсужденіи высочайшей особы важны, столь для Лавры
всема опасные, особливо в нынѣшнее время. Сего февраля 14 дня в недѣлю сырную
публично при столѣ, в присутствіи преосвященних Псковскаго и Тверскаго таким
отцем Платон произнес рѣчи. Я вам скажу куріозную и удивителную вѣсть, я сего дня
поутру, пришедший к Его высочеству нечаянно спросил, какой сей день недѣли и какое
на амбонѣ читается евангелие. Он отвѣтствовал, недѣля сырная и евангелие тотчас
сискал, развѣрнул лаврской печати библию, обявил при том, что он два дня
уже прочитал библию и нашел в оной погрѣшностей – четыреста шестдесят осѣм, и
оныя собственномѣрными отмѣтил почерками, в которых де не токмо ошибки, но и
великие с московскою библиею в разумѣ имѣются несходства. Я могу, сказал отец
Платон, испросить ту библию у Его высочества и хорошо б при указѣ синодальном
оную послать в Лавру с хорошим репримандом – надобно б де, Лаврѣ, добрую дать
финфу и проучить их хорошо, сами ортографіи не разумѣют, а знающаго из
стороны принять не хотят, и когда на эти рѣчи сказал один посторонний человѣк,
хорошо б им приутвердить указом, чтоб впредь исправно печатали, то сказано в отвѣт
было то, уже единожды и не дважды это подтверждали, но оны нас не слушают, и не
знаю в какую надежду как бы нарочно в противность отменно печатают московским
экземплярам, ми принуждены другие принять мѣры, в протчем имѣю сим быть
Вашея святини вседостойнѣйший слуга Агге́й.

1770 года 18 февраля
C.-Петербург.
Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv, f. 128, d.1 drukarskyi, c. 161,
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