

Religious Polemical Literature in the Ukrainian and Belarusian Lands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

Ihor Ševčenko

The Reformation and the Counter-Reformation were sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Western events that produced a ferment in the intellectual life of parts of Eastern Europe, including the Ruthenian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. There, the ferment found its most articulate expression in contemporary religious polemics that raged among Protestants, Catholics, Uniates, and Orthodox. Protestant polemics, restricted for the most part to the elite, can be described as skirmishes by generals without armies. In contrast, the debates over the Union of Brest (1596) involved a good part of society and even seeped down to the Cossacks. The various positions represented in the debates can be correlated with social and national differences in the area, and herein lies their interest and importance.

The history of the controversies falls into two periods. One, extending from the 1580s to about 1630, was centred in Vilnius and Western Ukraine; the other, extending from 1630 to the end of the century, was centred in Kiev. The writings of the first period are livelier and closer to events of the time than those of the second period, at which time they tend to be dogmatic and abstract. Most examples to be adduced here come from the first period.

During that first period, Catholic or Uniate authors generally led the attack; the Orthodox merely reacted, sometimes enlisting Protestant arguments—and, once, even a Protestant writer—in their cause. The Jesuit polemicist Piotr Skarga's *On the Unity of God's Church* (*O iedności Kościoła Bożego pod iednym pasterzem y o greckim od tey iedności odstąpieniu z przestrogą y upominaniem do narodów ruskich przy Grekach stojących...*,

Vilnius, 1577), which delivered the first thunderous salvo in the battle, went unanswered for exactly twenty years. The answer did finally come, in a work entitled *Apokrisis* (ΑΠΟΚΡΙΣΙΣ, *abo odpowiedź na xiążki o Synodzie Brzeskim imieniem ludzi starożytney religiey Greckiey, przez Christophora Philaletha w porywczą dana*), but it was written by the king's secretary, Marcin Broniewski, a Protestant Pole masquerading as an Orthodox Ruthenian. A Uniate pamphlet by Lev Krevza, entitled *The Defense of the Unity of the Church* (*Obrona iedności cerkiewney, abo dowody, ktorými się pokazuie iż Grecka Cerkiew z Łacinską ma być ziednoczona, podane do druku za roskazaniem...Oyca Jozefa Wielamina Rutkiego, Archiepiskopa y Metropolity Kiiowskiego, Halickiego y wszystkiey Rusi*),¹ appeared in 1617. It was answered by the enormous *Palinodija* (*Palinodia, siričь kniha oborony svjatoj apostol'skoj vsxodnij Cerkvi kafoliceskoj i svjatyx patriarchovъ i o Hrekoхъ i o Rossoхъ xristianexъ v lasce bożoj*) of Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj in about 1621.

In 1586, the Jesuit Benedykt Herbest published a pamphlet entitled *Wiary kościoła rzymskiego wywody y greckiego niewolstwa historya...* in defence of papal primacy and on behalf of the reform of the calendar introduced by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582. It was answered a year later by Herasym Smotryc'kyj, rector of the Ostroh Academy and father of Meletij Smotryc'kyj. Herasym refused to accept the new calendar, saying that it moved the date of Easter so far back that the latter would be celebrated in a blizzard. The Ruthenians were not alone in their rejection—various Protestant countries did not accept the Gregorian calendar until the eighteenth century, and Russia did so only in 1918. The Ruthenians, living in a state in which the Gregorian calendar had been adopted, and under attack by the Counter-Reformation church that had propagated it, continued to emphasize their distinctiveness by maintaining a stubborn attachment to the Julian calendar, which has persisted among Uniates into the twentieth century.

When it was the Catholics' turn to reply to the Orthodox, their reaction was quick. Meletij Smotryc'kyj's *Threnos* (Θρηνος, *to iest Lament iedyney ś. powszechney apostolskiey wschodniey cerkwie z objaśnieniem dogmat wiary—pierwey z Graeckiego na Słowieński, a teraz z Słowieńskiego na Polski przelożony. Przez Theophila Orthologa...*),² which made a splash in 1610, was countered by the formidable Skarga in the same year (*Na threny i lament Teofila Orthologa do Rusi greckiego nabożeństwa przestroga*, Cracow, 1610). These dates would seem to indicate that the Orthodox side, once awakened by the Catholics, started somewhat sluggishly, but, as time went on, its actions gathered momentum and were able occasionally to put the Catholics on the defensive.

We can distinguish traditionalists—at times, even reactionaries—among the Orthodox polemicists. A member of the Ostroh circle, Vasyľ

of Suraż (south-west of Białystok in present-day Poland)—author of the work without title, called after its first chapter *On the One Faith (O edinoj istinnoj pravoslavnoj vīri i o svjatoj sobornoj apostolskoj cerkvi, otkudu načalo prinjala i kako povsjudu rasprostresja*, published in Ostroh in 1588)—and Ivan Vyšens'kyj represented this traditional wing. The Protestant Marcin Broniewski, author of *Apokrisis*, represented the extreme end of the “progressive” wing. The anonymous author of *Perestoroħa (Perestoroħa žilo potrebnaja na potomnyje časy pravoslavnym xristianom svjatoje kafoličeskoje vostočnoje cerkve synom)* of 1605 or 1606 should be placed somewhere in between.

The differences between these three factions are to be sought not in their uniformly negative attitudes toward Catholic dogma, but in the literary form employed in their works and in their views on modern ways of education and learning. The traditionalists wrote in a less Polonized form of Church Slavonic, or in a Church Slavonic mixed with Ukrainian vernacular, and used Byzantine or para-Byzantine—in both cases, outmoded—polemical texts in Slavonic translation. They distrusted Latin and extolled the virtues of Church Slavonic. People in between, like the author of the *Perestoroħa*, wrote in a heavily Polonized vernacular and extolled the values of education, including worldly learning. Finally, the “progressives” wrote in brilliant Polish, betrayed Latin modes of thought in their prose, quoted Latin phrases, and dealt with questions of authenticity on the basis of whether the original of the incriminated text was written in Greek or in Latin.

Although on all sides the polemics were conducted with only a superficial show of learning, they were written with genuine gusto, uninhibited by anything like modern libel laws. The showing-off took the form of using Greek, mostly for the titles of the tracts: Smotryc'kyj's response of 1608 to a script accusing the Orthodox of heresy and ignorance was called *Antigraphe (Ἀντιγραφῆ, albo odpowiedź na script uszczypliwy, przeciwko ludziom starożytney religiey graeckiey od apostatow cerkwie wschodniey wydany, ktoremu tytuł: «Heresiae, ignorancie y politika popow y mieszczan bractwa wileńskiego» tak też y na książkę, rychło potym ku objaśnieniu tegoż skryptu wydaną, nazwiskiem «Harmonią»...*, Vilnius, 1608) which the author translated as “reply.” This called forth Potij's rejoinder, called *Antirrisis (ΑΝΤΙΡΡΗΣΙΣ, abo Apologia przeciwko Krzysztofowi Philaletowi który niedawno wydał książki imieniem starożytnej Rusi religji Greckiey przeciw książkom o synodzie Brzeskim napisanym w roku Pańskim 1597)*, the Greek word having the sense of “refutation” but also meaning “reply.” Broniewski's refutation of Skarga's work was called *Apokrisis*, which again means “reply.” In literature of this kind, the title *Apologia* is common: it was used for the tract written by Meletij Smotryc'kyj upon

becoming a Uniate (*Apologia peregrinathey do kraiów wschodnych...*, L'viv, 1628). A refutation of his work was called *Antapologia* (*Antapologia abo Apologiej, którą...O.M. Smotrycki...napisał, zniesienie*, 1632), an invented, if correctly formed, Greek term which, according to its creator, meant "refutation of the Apology." Setting Orthodox errors straight was the purpose of a work by Kasijan Sakovyč called *Epanorthōsis* (i.e., "correction") (*Ἐπανόρθωσις albo Perspectiwa y objaśnienie błędów, herezyey y zabo-bonów w grekoruskiej cerkwi disunickiej*, Cracow, 1642). It called for a response, and got one from no less a person than Peter Mohyla, who, writing under the pseudonym of Eusebius Pimin, and getting some editorial help, entitled his work *Lithos, or the Stone Hurlled From the Sling of Truth of the Holy Orthodox Rus' Church* (*Λίθος, abo kamień z procy prawdy cerkwie świętey prawosławney ruskiej na skruszenie fałecznociemney Perspektiwy abo raczey paszkwilu od Kassiana Sakowicza...*, Kiev, 1644). That "Stone" was in turn crushed by Sakovyč's *Adze, or Hammer for the Crushing of the Schismatic Stone Hurlled from the Kievan Monastery of the Caves by a Certain Eusebius Pimin* (*Oskard albo młot na skruszenie kamienia schyzmatyckiego, rzuconego z Ławry Kijowskiej Pieczarskiej od niejakiegoś Euzebjja Pimina*, Cracow, 1646). Pimin, which means "shepherd" in Greek, referred, of course, to Mohyla himself.

"Pimin" shows that the vogue for Greek extended to the names—or, rather, pseudonyms—that these authors chose for themselves. The king's secretary, Marcin Broniewski, a Protestant, hides under the mask of Christopher Philalet (i.e., "lover of truth"). Meletij Smotryč'kyj appears as Theophil Ortholog, meaning "man of true utterance," which adversaries turned into Mateolog, meaning "man of vain utterance." Indeed, puns of all sorts, not just Greek ones, abound in this literature. A Catholic would be called a *katolyk*, the word *lykos* meaning "wolf" in Greek. A metropolitan would be called a *metropolitae*, invoking the name of Pontius Pilate. The author Philalet was derided as *Philoplet*—the verb *pleść* means "to spin a yarn" in Polish, so the name Philoplet meant "lover of nonsense."

Authors affecting a more popular style used the device of rhymed prose, such as the one employed at the end of a colourful vignette in Herasym Smotryč'kyj's *Key to the Heavenly Kingdom* (*Ključ carstva nebesnoho*, probably Ostroh, 1587), concerning celibate Catholic priests and their patrons:

In the same way they took away from their clerics their legally wedded wives, preordained and offered by the Scriptures and by the holy apostles as well, wives who were confirmed by them in deed and writ. In their stead they substituted adultresses, and even when [the church authorities] did not substitute them, the [present-day] clerics themselves

think up the evil, given the fact that many of them openly keep [these women] with themselves [i.e., in their households] and they require a special stipend to be given to these women by their lords. "If your Grace has provided for the chaplain, there is a need for a laundress to boot"—while you, poor Ruthenian pope, must live in wretched poverty with your lawfully wedded wife (*potreba ešče i na pračku, a ty bidnyj pope ruskiј musyš i z zakonnoju nendzu klepaty neboraćku*).³

Other rhymes and puns that Smotryč'kyj employed for sarcastic or humorous purposes include: *onoho Formosa, za kotoroho stalsja kostel rymskyj jak lyce bez nosa* ("that <Pope> Formosus [the name means 'beautiful'] in whose time the Roman church became like a face without a nose [i.e., ugly]"); and *jakova toho černyla duxovnaja syla* ("what is the spiritual power of this ink [i.e., writing]").

Sometimes the style transcends the level of rhymes and puns and rises to that of a tragic dirge. That occurs in the following passage from *Perestoroħa*, in which a parallel is drawn between the time of Christ—sorely tried by the archpriests and by pagan Rome, represented by Pontius Pilate—and the author's own time:

For this very reason, at this end of Time, Satan, seeing that his power is coming to an end, is devastating the church through her elders, through the highest, most powerful, and wisest superiors, through the internal enemy—namely, through the archpriest of the Roman church, in the first place, and through the present pagan Turkish emperor, in the second.

The pope, who leads everyone away to his obedience—excommunicates, tortures, kills, sends armies, destroys states and churches, takes away all kinds of liberties, menaces, exclaims, bales, wages perpetual warfare, leading the powerful and the humble into temptation, asserts that the Catholic church must be situated at his court in Rome, sends his innovations (?) all over the world, sends the preachers of his new Order, the Jesuits, all over the world, and changes times and years—he confused and curtailed the counting from the creation of the world and concealed the anti-Christ. As if they were still waiting for the Messiah together with the Jews, they have rejected the blood of Christ, and are using unleavened bread together with the Jews according to the order of Aaron, and they reject the sacrifice of Christ, their priest-king according to the order of Melchizedek.

On the other hand, the pagan emperor has extended his dominion over the church, this having been brought about by the pope, and, just as the pope does, is dragging everyone under his sway, and is devastating churches and turning them into his mosques. The Son of Man has been given to the archpriests and pagans to be mocked, and while they are crucifying him, they deride him and say: "If you are the Son of Man, descend from the cross, and we will believe in you. You have saved other people; save yourself and those who are with you now."

Such is God's providence instituted from the very beginning of the world concerning our human kind: He always opposes the just people to the unjust.⁴

Of course, whatever place the Orthodox author may have held on the spectrum just outlined—whether he was a traditionalist, a middle-of-the-roader, or a “progressive”—his main topics were shared both by his fellow polemicists and by his Catholic adversaries. Topics on doctrine and canon law had to do with papal primacy, with the procession of the Holy Ghost, with the use of unleavened bread for communion, with purgatory, and with the celibacy of priests. Depending on the polemicist's point of view, the just cause would be defended by having recourse to Scripture and history, or else by equating Rome with Babylon and the pope with the anti-Christ. The procession of the Holy Ghost would be through the Father and the Son (i.e., *filioque*) or the Father alone. Holy communion would be taken by the adversary in the Jewish (i.e., Roman Catholic), or in the schismatic (i.e., Orthodox) manner. Purgatory would or would not exist, and saints and sinners would either enjoy bliss or suffer punishment from the very moment of death (according to Roman Catholicism), or would have to wait until the second coming of Christ (according to Orthodoxy). According to one side, the intellectual and spiritual development of the benighted Ruthenian priest was hampered by wife and children; according to the other, the Roman Catholic priest was mired in concubinage. Every one of these issues went back to Patriarch Photius (ninth century), Patriarch Michael Cerularius (eleventh century), or Metropolitan Mark of Ephesus (fifteenth century), and, in every case, stemmed from Byzantium.

Another set of arguments used in these polemics was somewhat more exciting: it can be called historical, and it centred on four events. The first concerned the baptism of Rus'. The question was whether Rus' had been baptized in an Orthodox font or in a Roman Catholic one (either because the conversion took place before the events of 1054, or because Christianity came to the Slavs from Rome via the Slavic apostles Cyril and Methodius). The Orthodox carried the day by maintaining that Rus' had received its faith from Constantinople and should remain under its jurisdiction. The second set of arguments revolved around the historical question: who was responsible for the schism? It ended in a draw. The third had to do with ecumenicity, legality, and the aftermath of the Council of Florence. It ended in a draw as well, or represented a small victory for the Orthodox. Indeed, it was equally possible to call the council *listrikijs'kyj* (i.e., “the robber's synod”)—borrowing the term applied to the Council of 449—or ecumenical (although the repercussions of this council in the Ukrainian and Belarusian lands were faint indeed).

Finally, there remained the history, denigration, and defence of the recent Council of Brest. Here passions ran highest, and the verdict—at least, that regarding the council's effectiveness—could only be given by posterity.

Posterity—that is, we ourselves—may be most interested in still another category of topics, which we might call local topics, or vignettes reflecting the state of mind and society as perceived by the polemicists. Here belongs the following statement by Peter Skarga:

There are only two languages, Greek and Latin, through which the Holy Faith has been spread and grafted onto the whole world. Outside those two no one can obtain perfection in any kind of learning, especially spiritual learning concerning the Holy Faith. This is not only because other languages are subject to constant change...but also because sciences are based only on these two languages, and cannot be translated into any other. The world has not known, and never will know, any academy or *collegium* where theology, philosophy, or other liberal arts could be taught and understood in any other language.⁵

This assertion only amuses any North American college student of today, but the Orthodox readers of Skarga's time must have been greatly offended by it. It was even more reactionary than the trilingual heresy against which the Slavic apostles Cyril and Methodius struggled in Venice in 867. At least the trilingualists admitted that there were *three* languages in which the word of God could be preached (Hebrew, in addition to Greek and Latin), while Skarga admitted only two. He reiterated the assertion in other terms as well. No one, he claimed, can acquire learning on the basis of the Church Slavonic language, because in order to understand Church Slavonic, the Orthodox must rely on Polish. No Ruthenian knows Greek, Greeks are ignorant of Slavonic and Ruthenian, and in Moscow laymen read more than priests do. All science is in the hands of Catholics. Against such accusations, Syl'vestr Kosov, a former teacher at the Mohyla *collegium*, archimandrite of the Caves Monastery in Kiev, and recently ordained bishop of the Belarusian sees of Mahilëŭ (Mogilev) and Ms'cislau' (Mstislavl'), was prompted to write a defence of the Orthodox schools in 1635 under the title *Exegesis, to iest danie sprawy o szkołach kiowskich y winickich, w których uczą zakonnicy Religiey graeckiey, przez wielebnego oycy Sylwestra Kossowa, electa episkopa Mścistauskiego, Mogilowskiego, Orszańskiego, przed rokiem terażnieyszym w tychże szkołach przez trzy lata profesora, napisane...1635*.⁶

Other vignettes, whether by Uniates or by the Orthodox, referred to the wretched social position of the Orthodox clergy, forced to perform statute labour and to plough landlords' fields (Ipatij Potij, *Antirrisis*). If a Catholic landlord saw a horse, a cow, or a bee swarm that belonged to an Orthodox cleric and wanted it, he simply took it away. "O just God,

look down from above and avenge," exclaimed Kopystens'kyj in his *Palinodija* of 1621. Some twenty-five years later, God would avenge, indeed.

One argument found in the polemics was of a triple nature: it was historical, timely, and even of local application. It had to do with the fall of the Byzantine Empire, which had occurred some one hundred fifty years before these polemical tracts were written. The fall suggested that something was wrong with Orthodoxy, the official faith of the Empire, which had been adopted by whole nations outside the Empire's boundaries. The tract *Perestoroĥa* has papists, heretics, and Jews say: "We do not believe you, because you do not have a Christian empire of your own in Constantinople." The following was the answer to the Jews: "Why were you not baptized during the long years [i.e., the eleven or twelve Christian centuries that preceded the fall of Constantinople to the Turks] during which you could have upheld the Christian Empire in that city?" In their polemics with the Catholics, the Orthodox of Ukraine met the perennial argument based on the fall of Byzantium by defending the Empire and extolling the spiritual purity of post-Byzantine Greeks, unencumbered by the cares of a worldly empire and free to seek the kingdom of God under the eye of the tolerant Turk. The Greeks no longer ruled, but this was an advantage when it came to the salvation of their souls. They had no choice but to be humble; they could no longer raise the sword, and even the pagans in whose midst they lived marvelled at their piety.

In Ukraine, however, deep respect for the Greeks and for Greek lore was limited to the erudite Orthodox. A less learned West Ukrainian writer of about 1600, Ivan Vyšens'kyj, scorned Plato and Aristotle and associated them with the great heretic Origen. He preferred John Chrysostom, or, better yet, the liturgical books: the *Hōrologion* and the *Oktoēchos*. He also thought that Slavic—by which he meant both Church Slavonic and the semi-vernacular language in which he himself wrote—was more honourable before God than Greek and Latin. Vyšens'kyj benefited from this loyalty to native tradition at the expense of Byzantine models: he is doubtless the most vigorous and exciting author of early seventeenth-century Ukrainian literature. Here we can draw a parallel with *Protopop* Avvakum of Muscovy. Avvakum also rejected what he called "Hellenic swiftness," stating that he was "not learned in dialectics," and wrote in practically vernacular Russian: he is also the most vigorous and best author of seventeenth-century Muscovite literature. There is one difference between the two writers, however, which helps to measure the distance that, in the mid-seventeenth century, separated their two cultural communities from Byzantium and Greece: when in need, Avvakum ex-

changed a book by Ephrem the Syrian for a horse and a *Nomocanon* (a collection of Canon Law) for the services of a helmsman, and did not know Greek; Vyšens'kyj, who spent much of his life as a solitary monk on Mt. Athos, must have known that language fairly well. He could make Greek puns and raise his Church Slavonic to the level of a calque of the Greek at will. Thus he called the hated emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus *Mateolog*, and in another passage, *Suetoslov*. Both mean "Mr. Vain Word," but one uses Greek, and the other, Slavonic components.

How many people read, or at least acquired, this polemical literature, and how passionately were they involved in it? We can give some kind of answer by extrapolating from the number of printed copies that survive, from manuscripts of works never published, and from data on single editions and their stock in printing houses. To conclude that a work not in print at the time of the polemics had no influence may be a mistake: Kopystens'kyj's *Palinodija* did not appear in print until 1876, and yet traces of it can be found in many works printed in the seventeenth century. Much of the printed literature must have been ephemeral, however, for some of the works are lost altogether or known only from citations of their titles in the polemics of their adversaries. This is the case with the initial reply to Skarga's work by the Protestant Motovylo, and with the *Orthodox Catechism* by Stefan Zyzanij (1595), known only from a Uniate refutation. All other lost works, as far as I know, were written by the Uniate side: *The True Account of the Synod of Brest* (*Spravedlivoje opisan'e postupku i spravy synodu Berestejskoho*, Vilnius, 1597); *The Second Epistle by Potij to Prince Konstantyn Ostroz'kyj* (dated 3 July 1598); *Heresies* (*Herezje, ignorancje, i polityka popów i mieszczan bractwa wileńskiego*, 1608), which provoked Meletij Smotryč'kyj's already mentioned *Antigraphe* of 1608; *Discussion Between a Man from Brest and a Member of a Confraternity* (*Rozmova berestjanina s bratčikom*, Vilnius, 1603); and *Nalyvajko Resurrected* (*Zmartwychwstały Nalewajko*, 1608).

Some of the tracts—usually the ones written in defence of the Catholic cause or of the Union of Brest—were republished in modern times from a single, often defective, remaining copy. Some examples are the first edition of Skarga's work of 1577, the Ukrainian text of Potij's *Antirrisis*, and the Belarusian-Ukrainian text of Skarga's *Description and Defence of the Council of Brest* (*Opisan'e i oborona soboru Ruskoho Berestejskoho v roku 1596*), dated 1597. The Polish copy of the same work, published in 1596, was unknown in the Russian Empire in 1903, but may have existed in the Polish city of Toruń. Modern editors used the editions of 1610 and 1783. Finally, here belongs, on the Orthodox side, Herasym Smotryč'kyj's *Ključ carstva nebesnoho*, presumably dating from 1587, preserved in one defective copy in Kiev. Some works are known in only

a few copies, either because the editions became depleted (e.g., Broniewski's *Apokrysis*, which was a rarity by 1630), or because adversaries bought up an edition and burned it (according to Skarga, this was the fate of his own book in 1577). The Orthodox also burned copies of Smotryc'kyj's *Apologia* of 1628. Finally, an Orthodox work might be confiscated by the Crown, as happened with Smotryc'kyj's *Threnos*, written when the author was still Orthodox. On the other hand, a curious detail about *Threnos*'s fate suggests the wide dissemination of polemical literature: when the magistrates arrived to destroy Smotryc'kyj's work, they found only 36 copies of the *Threnos* left at the printer's. Incidentally, in Moscow, literature imported from Ukraine seems to have appeared in large editions and to have enjoyed great popularity. Pseudo-Nathanael's *Book on Faith* (*Knížica o v'rii*), published in Ukraine in 1644, was reprinted in Moscow in 1658 in 1200 copies; 850 copies of the Moscow edition were purchased within two months of its appearance.

Judging by these figures, the anti-Uniate movement was stronger and more popular than the Uniate one.⁷ The number of lost, rare, or partially destroyed Uniate writings is larger, even though most of them were printed in Poland-Lithuania, which protected the Union and occasionally confiscated anti-Uniate works.

Such a crude quantitative analysis of the readership of polemical literature might also be useful if applied to its authors: this on account of the information it could yield on the social, educational, and geographical background of the authors themselves and of their patrons. In addition, places of publication and the languages used in the tracts should be tabulated.⁸ Here, by applying a rule of thumb, we come up with some surprising finds. Thus the number of anti-Uniate authors of noble descent turns out to be larger than one might have anticipated. Of seven commoners, five were connected with the church. In fact, the large majority of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century authors were ecclesiastics. We have to wait until the eighteenth century for the emergence of a group of lay writers coming from the ranks of higher Cossack bureaucracy, such as the compilers of the Cossack "chronicles." Another surprise concerns the geographical background of the anti-Uniate—or, at least, Orthodox—polemicists of the first period. All eight of them were from Western Ukraine, and of those, all but two were from Galicia. This finding should provide food for thought to a modern observer of Ukraine who is accustomed to identifying the west of the country with the Uniate church.

By comparison, the results of tabulating places of publication are less surprising, unless one is struck by the realization that much of the polemical literature of the earlier period was published outside Ukraine. Most of the texts, both Orthodox and Uniate, that were published

between 1595 and 1617 came from Vilnius; Ostroh was second in importance, but disappeared as a source of printing by 1600. Kiev began to figure in 1619 and L'viv in 1629, but in the latter case the polemical work was Uniate.

The patrons of polemical literature stand out by their rarity. Among the high nobility, the Orthodox Prince Konstantyn Ostroz'kyj is easily in first place, for at least five polemical books were dedicated to him. He is followed by his Catholic son Janusz and by the Orthodox Myxajlo Vyš-nevec'kyj (Michał Wiśniowiecki), father of Jarema. Among the princes of the church, only Metropolitan Myxajlo Rahoza of Kiev comes to mind for the early period: the L'viv Confraternity dedicated its Greco-Slavonic *Prosphōnēma* to him in 1591.

About the language of the polemics there are no surprises to report. While the Orthodox wrote in the Polonized vernacular more often than the Uniates did, the works of the first period (whether Orthodox, Uniate, or Catholic) were more often than not written in Polish.

What about Muscovy, then? Skarga, in his work of 1577, claimed to know what "pulled [the Rus' nation] away from unity with the [Catholic] church," and what "was the greatest stumbling block in the way of unity." The reasons were "the glances you Ruthenians were casting toward the Muscovite churches and the successes the Muscovite prince was experiencing in his rule in our time and toward people with whom you share the same language and religion."⁹ In spite of his last statement, Skarga could not quite have believed that the people of Rus' spoke the same language as the Muscovites, because in another place in the same work he clearly distinguished between Rus' and Muscovy. Still, he must have had reasons for singling out Moscow as the chief stumbling block to union. Was this assessment correct? As yet no answer has been given; future research might look for it among the writings of Orthodox polemicists and of other authors active, say, between 1577 and 1704¹⁰, both by collecting direct indications of their feelings towards the Muscovite ruler and by analyzing symptomatic phrases of Ruthenian, Polish and Muscovite origin, such as the use of the terms *Rus'*, *ruski*, *do narodów ruskich*, *rusak*, *rus'kyj*, *Rossija*, *rosiejski*, *rossiyski*, *roxolański*, *rhōssaikos*, and *rossijs'kyj*. One should also determine the social status of individual polemicists.

Take, for example, the Kievan Metropolitan Jov Borec'kyj. In his Polish *Protestacja* of 1621, Borec'kyj echoed Skarga when he stated that "we," that is, the Orthodox of Ukraine and the Cossacks, shared "faith, liturgy, origin, language and customs" with Moscow; no disloyalty to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was implied, however. Borec'kyj wished only to show to the Polish side how absurd it was to accuse both

the Orthodox hierarch and the Cossacks of conniving with the Turk.¹¹

Take, as another example, the Belarusian Afanasij Filipovič, for some time monk of the Kupjatyči Monastery and later *hegumen* in Brest. Some ten years before the Cossack wars, he travelled to Moscow to collect alms for a miraculous icon of the Theotokos and to petition Tsar Mixail Fedorovič. He was not overtly pro-Cossack; his Diary of 1646 contains not a single good word about them. Yet he was accused by Polish vigilantes of sending gunpowder and letters to the Cossacks in 1648; although he denied the accusation, and no proof could be found to substantiate it, he was executed. When Filipovič, who had a neurotic streak, was accused of being against the Union, he admitted it readily, even stridently. He wanted peace within the Commonwealth, and knew that it could be realized only if the Union were abolished. He considered that to be the only way to put an end to the Cossack wars.

Filipovič also wrote a loyal "supplication" to King Władysław IV, in which he thundered against the Union and respectfully pointed out all the alleged evidence that the pope had severed himself from the other four patriarchs. But he also wrote something more unusual: he complimented the king on sending a pretender to the Muscovite throne back to Moscow for investigation; he praised him for loving the holy concord (i.e., for not pushing too strongly for the Union), for loving the Eastern people (i.e., the Orthodox), and—for loving Moscow. If we collect more data of this kind, we may be able to proceed beyond guesses.

The polemicists of the period we have investigated did not seek truth—they possessed it already, regardless of which side they were on. The arguments they used were not meant to convince adversaries, but to strengthen the beliefs and resolve of their own supporters. The importance of the polemics does not lie in their intellectual content, but in the stimulus they provided for an intellectual movement in Ukraine. During their early period, the polemical debates between Catholics, Uniates, Protestants, and the Orthodox created a climate that made the success of the Kiev Mohyla *collegium* possible.

Notes

1. On the works of Lev Krevza and Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj, see: Omeljan Pritsak and Bohdan Struminsky, Introduction to *Lev Krevza's "Obrona iednosci cerkiewney..."* and *Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj's "Palinodija,"* Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts, vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. xi-lviii.

2. On Meletij Smotryč'kyj and his works, see the series of articles by David Frick: "Meletij Smotryč'kyj and the Ruthenian Question in the Early Seventeenth Century," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8 (1984), pp. 351-375; "Meletij Smotryč'kyj and the Ruthenian Language Question," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 9 (1985), pp. 25-52; Introduction to *The Collected Works of Meletij Smotryč'kyj*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. xi-xxxviii; Introduction to *The "Jevanhelije učytelnoje" of Meletij Smotryč'kyj*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts, vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. ix-xvi.
3. Cf. *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii*, pt. 1, vol. 7 (Kiev, 1887), pp. 242, 243, 261; cf. also Myxajlo Voznjak, *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, vol. 2, pt. 1 (Lviv, 1921), p. 123. This and the subsequent translations from the sources are by the author of the present article.
4. Myxajlo Voznjak, *Pys'mennyc'ka dijaj'nist' Ivana Borec'koho na Volyni i u L'vovi* (L'viv, 1954), p. 48.
5. Cf. *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka*, vol. 7 (1882), p. 485; cf. also Voznjak, *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 41.
6. On Syl'vestr Kosov and his works, see Paulina Lewin, Introduction to *Seventeenth-Century Writings of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts, vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. xi-xxiv.
7. On the history of the book trade in Ukraine, Belarus, and Muscovy during this period, see Jaroslav Isaievych, "The Book Trade in Eastern Europe in the Seventeenth and Early Eighteenth Centuries," in *Consumption and the World of Goods*, John Brewer and Roy Porter, eds. (London, 1993), pp. 381-392.
8. Lists of polemical writings are found in: Myxajlo Voznjak, *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, vol. 2: *Viky XVI-XVIII*, pt. 1 (Lviv, 1921), pp. 356-376 (some inexactitudes); Antoine Martel, *La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes: Ukraine et Russie Blanche, 1569-1667*, Travaux et mémoires de l'Université de Lille, Nouvelle série: Droit et lettres, vol. 20 (Lille, 1938), pp. 132-141; A. Brückner, "Spory o Unię w dawnej literaturze," *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 1896, no. 3, pp. 578-644. Biographical data on authors of the polemical writings, lists of their works, and related bibliography are provided by Leonid Maxnovec', *Ukrajins'ki pys'mennyky: Bio-bibliohrafičnyj slovnyk*, vol. 1: *Davnja ukrajins'ka literatura X-XVII st. st.* (Kiev, 1960).
9. *Pamjatniki polemičeskoj literatury*, vol. 2, Petr Giltebrandt, ed. (= *Russkaja istoričeskaja biblioteka*, vol. 7 [St. Petersburg, 1882]), pp. 497-498.
10. These years refer to the respective dates of publication of Piotr Skarga's *O iedności Kościoła Bożego* and of Fedor Polikarpov's *Leksikon trejazyčnyj*.
11. Platon Žukovič, "Protestacija mitropolita Iova Boreckago i drugix zapadno-russkix ierarxov, sostavlenaja 28 aprelja 1621 goda," in V. I. Lamanskij, ed., *Stat'i po slavjanovedeniju*, vyp. 3 (1910), pp. 135-153, esp. p. 143.

Bibliographic Note

- Brückner, Alexander. "Spory o Unię w dawnej literaturze," *Kwartalnik Historyczny* 10 (1896), pp. 578-644.
- Cyževs'kyj, Dmytro. "Ivan Vyšens'kyj." *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the USA* 1 (1951), pp. 113-26.
- _____. *A History of Ukrainian Literature: From the 11th to the End of the 19th Century*. Trans. Dolly Ferguson, Doreen Gorsline, Ulana Petyk. Ed. and with a foreword by George S. N. Luckyj. Littleton, Colorado, 1975.
- Franko, Ivan. *Ivan Vyšens'kyj i joho tvory*. L'viv, 1895.
- Goldblatt, Harvey. "Ivan Vyšens'kyj's Conception of St. John Chrysostom and his Idea of Reform for the Ruthenian Lands." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 16 (1992), pp. 37-66.
- Grabowicz, George G. "The Question of Authority in Ivan Vyšens'kyj: A Dialectics of Absence." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12/13 (1988/89), pp. 781-94.
- Grabowski, Tadeusz. *Z dziejów literatury unicko-prawosławnej w Polsce 1630-1700*. Poznań, 1922.
- Hruševs'kyj, Myxajlo. *Kul'turno-nacional'nyj rux na Ukrajinі XVI-XVII st.* 2d ed. Kiev, 1919.
- Hunczak, Taras. "The Politics of Religion: The Union of Brest 1596." *Ukrajins'kyj istoryk*, no. 2-4 (1972), pp. 97-106.
- Koršunov, A. *Afanasij Filippovič: Žizn' i tvorčestvo*. Moscow, 1965.
- Lewin, Paulina and Frank E. Sysyn. "The Antimaxia of 1632 and the Polemic over Uniate-Orthodox Relations." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 9 (1985), pp. 145-65.
- Pritsak, Omeljan. "The Hypatian Chronicle and its Role in the Restoration of Ukrainian Historical Consciousness." *Čomu katedru ukrajinoznavstva v Harvardi? Vybir stattej na temu našoji kul'turnoji polityky (1967-1973)*, pp. 54-60. Cambridge, Mass., and New York, 1973.
- Sysyn, Frank E. "The Cultural, Social, and Political Context of Ukrainian History: 1620-1690." *Europa Orientalis* 5 (1986), pp. 285-310.
- Tretiak, Józef. *Piotr Skarga w dziejach i literaturze Unji Brzeskiej*. Cracow, 1912.
- Voznjak, Myxajlo. *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*. Vol. 2, pt. 1. L'viv, 1921.
- _____. *Pys'mennyc'ka dijאל'nist' Ivana Borec'koho na Volyni i u L'vovi*. L'viv, 1954.