

1 The Formation of Modern Ukrainian Religious Culture: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

Frank E. Sysyn

Few institutions lend themselves as well as the church to examination for a millennium. Religious institutions and traditions change more slowly than their secular counterparts. For example, it was only in the twentieth century that the Orthodox in the Ukraine first replaced Church Slavonic with Ukrainian in the liturgy and that Uniates (Greek or Ukrainian Catholics) introduced mandatory celibacy in some dioceses. The conservatism of the churches makes it possible to speak of millennial aspects of Ukrainian Christianity. Nevertheless, modification and change have indeed occurred at various rates in different times. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—the age of Reformation and Counter-Reformation, Cossack revolts and Polish, Muscovite and Ottoman intervention, the introduction of printing, and the formation of an Eastern Christian higher educational institution in Kiev—were a period of especially rapid change. The great Orthodox scholar, Georges Florovsky, labelled this age ‘The Encounter with the West’, and viewed it as an unstable and dangerous time, which bore only sterile progeny.¹ Other scholars have seen it as a period of great accomplishments that arose from challenges to the Ukrainian religious genius.²

It should suffice to list a number of ‘firsts’ in the early part of this period to see the beginnings of modern church life in the Metropolitanate of Kiev. In the early sixteenth century, the Belorussian printer Frantsishak Skaryna published the first liturgical books on Ruthenian territories. In the 1560s, the Peresopnytsia Gospel was translated into Ruthenian vernacular. In 1562–63, Szymon Budny published the first works for Protestant believers in Ruthenian. In 1574 Cyrillic printing began in Ukrainian territories, in Lviv, with a primer that was the

first of numerous books to teach literacy. In the late 1570s, Prince Konstantyn Ostroz'kyi established the first Orthodox higher educational institution in Ostroh. In 1580–81, the Ostroh circle published the first complete Slavonic Bible. In the 1580s, the burghers of Lviv strengthened their communal life by organizing a brotherhood or fraternity centred at the newly-rebuilt Church of the Assumption. Receiving Stauropegial rights that subordinated the brotherhood directly to the patriarch of Constantinople, the brotherhood challenged the authority of the local bishop. In the 1590s, the Orthodox bishops began to meet regularly at synods to discuss reform of the church. In 1595 the bishop of Volodymyr, Ipatii Potii, and the bishop of Luts'k, Kyrylo Terlets'kyi, travelled to Rome to negotiate a church union, which was proclaimed the next year by the metropolitan and five bishops at a synod at Brest. An opposing synod attended by two bishops met in the same city and rejected the union. In 1596, Lavrentii Zizanii published the first Slavonic-Latin-Greek lexicon. In the last years of the sixteenth century, opposing sides polemicized in print in Ruthenian and Polish about the Union of Brest. Alarmed by the Orthodox counter-offensive, the Uniates began to shore up their institution, establishing a seminary in Vilnius in 1601 and creating a Basilian monastic order along western lines in 1613. In 1615, the burghers of Kiev and the inhabitants of the surrounding region formed a brotherhood and later a school. Combined with the printing press at the Caves Monastery, these institutions made Kiev the centre of religious and cultural activities. In 1618 Meletii Smotryts'kyi published a grammar of Church Slavonic that established the norms of the language. In 1632, Mohyla, as metropolitan and archimandrite of the Caves Monastery, formed a collegium in Kiev. By 1642, he had compiled a confession of the Orthodox faith, which was later accepted by other Orthodox churches.³

From the late sixteenth to mid-seventeenth century, the Eastern Christian believers of the Ukraine and Belorussia, with their activist hierarchs and churches, their numerous schools and monasteries, their scores of new titles of books in Slavonic, Ruthenian and Polish, their numerous innovations in institutions—brotherhoods, synods of the clergy and the laity, western-patterned religious orders—and their elaborate debates on church history, structure, and beliefs, had entered a new age. Generations of historians have examined the events and the achievements of the period. However the age is evaluated, there is agreement that from the mid-sixteenth century to the end of the seventeenth century, church life was fundamentally

transformed in the Ukraine. With this transformation the foundation was laid for Ukrainian religious traditions that have endured into the modern age. More recent ecclesiastical movements find their precedents in this formative period. In acts such as establishing the Orthodox society named in honour of Peter Mohyla in Volhynia in the 1930s and as calling for the Soviet government to recognise the legality of the Uniate or Ukrainian Catholic Church, twentieth-century Ukrainian churchmen and believers have frequently used the symbols, rhetoric and institutions that evolved about four hundred years ago.⁴ This paper merely aims to suggest some of the major traditions or themes that have an enduring impact on Ukrainian religious culture.

This discussion will concentrate on religious traditions among Ukrainian Eastern Christian believers. While in many respects Ukrainians shared a common 'Ruthenian' religious culture of the Kiev Metropolitanate with Belorussians, it was in the sixteenth century that Ukrainian and Belorussian political, cultural and religious history began to diverge more significantly. The Union of Lublin of 1569 divided most of the central and eastern Ukrainian territories formerly part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the Belorussian territories and united them with the western Ukrainian lands in the Kingdom of Poland. The Cossack Host developed primarily in the Ukrainian lands and in time created a political and social elite lacking in Belorussia. By the same token, economic and demographic advances supported a greater vitality in cultural and religious activities in the Ukrainian territories. In religious affairs, the Ukrainian territories became relatively more important in the life of the Kiev Metropolitanate at the end of the sixteenth century, in part because elites in Belorussia were less resistant to conversion to Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The return of the metropolitans to their titular city of Kiev in the 1590s symbolized this change. In the first half of the seventeenth century, the religious cultures of Ukraine and Belorussia diverged further because the Orthodox dominated in the Ukrainian lands, while the Uniates had more success in the Belorussian territories. Finally the formation of an Orthodox Cossack Hetmanate stimulated a development of specific Ukrainian religious traditions in Kiev and the Left-Bank Ukraine. Despite these differences, the religious culture of the seventeenth century can be viewed as a Ruthenian inheritance from which interacting Ukrainian and Belorussian variants took shape. Therefore the traditions outlined here are often also pertinent to

Belorussian religious culture, though they have evolved differently in Belorussia in the modern period.

Discussion of Ukrainian religious culture will be confined to Eastern Christians, the adherents of the traditional Rus' Church. However, the distinctiveness of Ruthenian Eastern Christian religious culture arose, in part, because of religious pluralism. Jews, Muslims, Armenian Gregorians, Latin-Rite Catholics, and Protestants all inhabited the Ukrainian and Belorussian territories alongside Orthodox, and after 1596, Uniate, Rus' Christians. These groups both interacted with the Eastern Christians and represented 'other' religious and cultural traditions. For example, the identification of Roman Catholicism as the 'Liakhs' or Poles' faith in the Ukrainian lands made religious adherence coincide with cultural-national identification and conversion implied a change in cultural affiliation. The Protestant Reformation emerged from the Western Christian community, but made converts throughout the Ukraine, including among the Orthodox. While the Calvinists, Antitrinitarians and Lutherans did not constitute religious bodies that descended directly from the Rus' tradition, they were influenced by their Eastern Christian surroundings. The Counter-Reformation arose to meet the Protestant challenge, but it too directed its efforts to converting Eastern Christians. Latin Catholics, Protestants, and other groups challenged and stimulated the Ruthenian Eastern Christians.⁵

The major significance of the period for Ukrainian and Belorussian Eastern Christians was their division in 1596 into Orthodox and Uniate believers and churches. Before the late sixteenth century, attempts to unite Ukrainian and Belorussian believers with Rome had been episodic and had not divided the larger religious community. From 1596, Ukrainian and Belorussian believers have been permanently divided into two churches—one which rejects the Union and holds to Orthodoxy and one which accepts the Union and adheres to Catholicism. Both claim to be the true continuation of the church that was formed by the conversion of Rus' of 988.⁶

Modern Ukrainian religious culture emerged in the Kiev Metropolitanate of the sixteenth century.⁷ From the conversion of 988 until the early fourteenth century, one Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' had encompassed all East Slavic territories. By the twelfth century, Kiev no longer possessed the paramount political influence in Rus' and the Mongol conquest hastened the disintegration of political unity of the vast Kiev Metropolitanate. In the early fourteenth century, the Orthodox ruler of Galicia-Volhynia, Prince Iurii,

convinced the Patriarchate of Constantinople temporarily to establish a Metropolitanate of Little Rus' for the eparchies of Peremyshl', Halych, Volodymyr, Luts'k, Turov and Kholm. More lasting was the migration of the Kiev metropolitans to the Suzdal lands in the early fourteenth century, where they later took up residence in Moscow. Until 1458 growing centrifugal forces made the retention of a united Kiev Metropolitanate seem difficult. The Galician or 'Little Rus'' Metropolitanate was temporarily revived in 1370 on the insistence of Kazimierz the Great, the Polish ruler who annexed Galicia to his domains. Grand princes of Lithuania, whose domains reached to Kiev by 1362, sought to have their candidates appointed metropolitan of Kiev and to have them reside in their state. When they could not do so, they strove to have separate metropolitanates established for their numerous Ruthenian subjects. In general, the patriarchs of Constantinople preferred to retain the unity of the Kiev Metropolitanate and to entrust its headquarters to the steadfastly Orthodox princes of Moscow rather than to the Catholic kings of Poland or to the pagan and, after 1386, Catholic rulers of Lithuania.⁸

The Patriarchate of Constantinople brought about the final division of the Kiev Metropolitanate by its own wavering in adherence to Orthodoxy. Muscovy refused to accept the Union of Florence of 1439 and the Greek Metropolitan of Kiev, Isidore. Consequently it rejected the authority of the patriarchs of Constantinople and declared autocephaly by electing its own metropolitan (1448). In the Ukrainian and Belorussian lands, controlled by Catholic rulers, no such rejection of Constantinople's authority or the Metropolitan Isidore occurred. Therefore, when in 1458 a new metropolitan of 'Kiev and all Rus'' was elected for the lands of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Kingdom of Poland, a permanent break ensued between the two parts of the Kievan Metropolitan See. The change of the title of the metropolitan in Moscow from 'Kiev and all Rus'' to 'Moscow and all Rus'' brought titulature in line with reality. Although the Union of Florence failed to take hold in both Constantinople and in the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the division of the old Kievan Metropolitanate into Ruthenian and Muscovite churches endured.

For both metropolitanates the events of the mid-fifteenth century speeded the indigenisation, indeed, the nationalisation, of the church. In earlier centuries, metropolitans had frequently been Greeks and in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries foreigners still figured prominently (Gregory Tsamblak and Isidore). At the same

time, the cultural distinctness of Russians and Ruthenians, who differed in vernacular and administrative languages and lived under markedly different political and social systems, made a metropolitan from Muscovy or one from the Grand Duchy of Lithuania more and more alien in the other territory. From 1448 to the declaration of Moscow as a patriarchate in 1589, all metropolitans of Moscow were native Russians, while from 1458 to the subordination of Kiev to Moscow in 1686 most metropolitans of Kiev and bishops of the metropolitanate were native Ruthenians. The final division of Ruthenian and Muscovite churches and their different experiences from the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries furthered the evolution of distinct religious traditions.

For the Kiev Metropolitanate, the major problems of the fifteenth century were dealing with the consequences of the Union of Florence and finding a place for itself in Catholic states.⁹ As Constantinople renounced the Union of Florence, the daughter church of Kiev reasserted its Orthodox allegiance. Nevertheless, in the first century after the fall of Constantinople, the patriarchs displayed little initiative in guiding their distant daughter church, and the church became increasingly dependent on Catholic rulers and Orthodox lay lords. Throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, the Polish and Lithuanian governments enacted legislation that placed the church and its believers in a disadvantageous position in comparison to the Catholic Church. Although the Protestant Reformation weakened the privileged position of the Catholic Church, the Protestant believers and their Catholic opponents engaged in an intellectual battle in which the Orthodox Church was unprepared to take part. Western Christian political dominance and intellectual and organizational superiority combined to challenge a Kiev Metropolitanate that could not depend on Orthodox rulers, domestic or foreign, for support, and that found its Slavonic cultural inheritance deficient in answering the new challenges. Faced with the increasing defections to the Protestants and Catholics, particularly from among the Orthodox nobles, the Kiev Metropolitanate was endangered with dissolution in the sixteenth century. The response to the challenges brought about numerous innovations in religious culture. One of the responses, however, the acceptance of union with Rome by the metropolitan and most of the bishops brought about an institutional division in the Metropolitanate. After 1596, the Orthodox Church had to compete with a Uniate Kiev Metropolitanate.

From 1596 to 1620, the Orthodox Church had no metropolitan and

was viewed as illegal by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In 1620, Patriarch Theophanos of Jerusalem consecrated Metropolitan Iov Borets'kyi and five bishops. The government viewed the election of Iov Borets'kyi and his successor, Isaia Kopyn'skyi, as illegitimate. Bowing to the pressure from the Orthodox nobility and the Zaporozhian Cossacks, the newly elected king Wladyslaw IV and the Diet recognised the Orthodox Church as legal in 1632, but assigned only half of the eparchies of the metropolitanate to the Orthodox and required the election of a new hierarchy to replace the hierarchy ordained in 1620.

From 1632 to 1647, Metropolitan Peter Mohyla strove to strengthen the Orthodox Metropolitanate's institutional structure throughout the Commonwealth, including in the eparchies assigned to the Uniates. Mohyla used his wealth and his influence with the government to carry out a far-reaching programme of development of education and printing, as well as of reform of church practices. He entertained the possibility of a union with Rome on better terms than the Union of Brest, but never made a final commitment.¹⁰

Mohyla's successor as Orthodox metropolitan of Kiev, Sylvester Kosov (1647–1657) led the church in more turbulent times. The Cossack revolt that developed into an Ukrainian uprising improved the position of the Orthodox Metropolitanate on a number of occasions. In 1649, the Polish King Jan Kazimierz promised to abolish the Union, and the church gained advantages even though the commitment was never carried out fully. In the territories controlled by Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi, Latin Catholic as well as Uniate institutions and lands were given over to the Orthodox. There were, however, negative consequences of the revolt and the establishment of the Cossack Hetmanate for the Kiev Metropolitanate. The Pereiaslav Agreement of 1654 placed the status of the metropolitanate in question. Its leadership feared correctly that ties with Muscovy would result in Russian interference in church affairs and the eventual transfer of the metropolitanate from the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople to the patriarch of Moscow.¹¹

Already in Kosov's time, the Muscovites insisted that the metropolitan limit his traditional title of 'Kiev, Halych and all Rus'' to 'Kiev, Halych and all Little Rus'. In addition, victorious Muscovite armies in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania sought to detach Belorussian areas from the Kiev Metropolitanate and to annex them to the Moscow Patriarchate. Metropolitan Kosov died in April, 1657, four months before Bohdan Khmel'nyts'kyi. At this critical political moment for

the Ukraine, the clergy of the Kiev Metropolitanate with the authorization of the new hetman, Ivan Vyhovs'kyi, elected Dionisii Balaban as metropolitan with the blessing of the patriarch of Constantinople. Balaban supported Vyhovs'kyi in his break with Moscow and his negotiation of the Union of Hadiach (8 September 1658), which sought to reintegrate the central Ukrainian lands into the Commonwealth as a Rus' duchy, to guarantee places in the Polish-Lithuanian Senate for the metropolitan and bishops, and to abolish the Union of Brest. The failure of Vyhovs'kyi and the Hadiach policy forced the metropolitan to abandon the city of Kiev and to take up residence in territories controlled by the Commonwealth. Until his death in 1663, Balaban could not exercise control over the Ukrainian territories on the Left-Bank of the Dnieper. The Muscovite authorities appointed Lazar Baranovych, the bishop of Chernihiv, as administrator in these territories in 1659, thereby beginning the division of the Kiev Metropolitanate along political boundaries.

Political events rapidly eroded the unity and autonomy of the Kievan Metropolitan See in the second half of the seventeenth century. In 1685–86, during the election of Metropolitan Gedeon Chetvertyns'kyi, the Russian government arranged the transfer of the Kiev Metropolitan See from the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople to that of the patriarch of Moscow through pressure and bribes. Nevertheless, the particular cultural and religious traditions of the late-sixteenth and seventeenth-century metropolitanate and the unique position of Kiev endured well into the eighteenth century. It served as a model for twentieth-century movements for the formation of autonomous and autocephalous churches in the Ukraine and Belorussia.

The Uniate heir to the Kiev Metropolitan See was not able to win a mass following in the Ukrainian lands until the late seventeenth century, but it did produce dedicated followers and important traditions. The mediocre Metropolitan Mykhailo Rahoza who acceded to the Union was followed by the energetic Ipatii Potii (1601–13) and Iosyf Ruts'kyi (1613–37) as 'metropolitans of Kiev, Halych and all Rus''. They weathered numerous setbacks. The disappointment that two bishops and a large body of the clergy and the laity would not accede to the Union was followed by the blows of the Senate's refusal to grant seats to the Uniate bishops, the Diet's concessions of benefices to the Orthodox, the government's unwillingness to move decisively against the 'illegal' Orthodox metropoli-

tan and hierarchy consecrated in 1620 and the recognition of the Orthodox Metropolitanate as an equal competitor to the Uniate in 1632. In the first fifty years, the Uniate Church was more successful in attracting followers in the Belorussian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania than it was in the Ukrainian territories of the Kingdom of Poland, except for the Kholm area. The great Cossack revolt in 1648 placed the very existence of the Uniate Church in doubt. Nevertheless, in the second half of the seventeenth century, the Uniate Kiev Metropolitanate began to take shape, assisted by support from Rome and some zealous Catholics in the Commonwealth. The retention of all Belorussia, Galicia and the Right-Bank Ukraine by the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth after 1667 ensured the victory of the Union in these lands by the early eighteenth century. Reaching its greatest extent in the eighteenth century, the Uniate Church took on its own stable ecclesiastical form at the Synod of Zamość in 1720. The triumph of the Russian Empire over the Commonwealth was to devastate the Uniate Church, so that it would only survive in the Galician lands annexed by the Habsburgs, the very territories that had been so anti-Uniate before 1700. Still, the Galician Metropolitan See established in 1807 continued the traditions of the Uniate Kiev Metropolitanate. Despite changes in titlature and legal rights, the Ukrainian Catholic Church asserts its direct claims to the heritage of the Metropolitanate of Kiev, Halych, and All-Rus'.¹²

The major tradition of this period, for both Orthodox and Uniates, was the emergence of new religious forms that represented an absorption and adaptation of influences from Latin Christianity, which had accompanied the control of the Ukrainian lands by Western Christian powers in the fourteenth century. At the core of Ruthenian culture was a deeply-rooted Byzantine-Slavonic tradition embodied in a church that maintained an institutional structure, permeating the thousands of settlements in the Ukrainian and Belorussian lands. As an institution of the Rus' faith, the church functioned in a conserving role for a local culture, while at the same time connecting it to a Byzantine past, a larger Orthodox community and a supranational Slavonic culture. Latin Christian political domination was accompanied by the placement of the Orthodox Church in an inferior position and with restrictions on the Orthodox and their worship. Consequently the Rus' Church in Ukraine experienced the perils that religious pluralism poses for a church in a subservient position. As Latin Christian culture evolved and

flourished, the Orthodox of the Ukraine found themselves representatives of an increasingly isolated and inadequate cultural tradition.

This threat ultimately proved to be a stimulus that produced so many of the achievements outlined earlier. Although the Orthodox of the Ukraine had faced the western challenge without the protection of an Orthodox ruler or even the neutrality of a Muslim ruler, they were able to accommodate to Western practices and influences over a long period of time. Both the decision of Polish kings in the fourteenth century to tolerate Orthodoxy, and even to grant the Orthodox elite noble status, and the manifest numerical and political strength of the Orthodox Ruthenians in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which negated discriminatory legislation, had permitted the Orthodox Church to adjust gradually to Western Christian rule. Even in the cities, where Orthodox were subject to harsh discrimination and numerous restrictions, they were able to maintain some religious and communal institutions. By the sixteenth century, religious divisions among Western Christians and the weak powers of central administration in contrast to extensive liberties of individual nobles mitigated the pressures on the Orthodox.¹³

The process of contact with Western Christian culture has still to be studied satisfactorily. Complex cultural changes and adaptation occurred from the fifteenth century, when a Iurii of Drohobych presumably converted and became a rector of the University of Bologna to the seventeenth century, when an Orthodox university was established in Kiev. The Orthodox Church and the Byzantine-Slavonic-Ruthenian culture long seemed inert and unattuned to the challenges of the Latin West. Their eventual response demonstrated how serious the challenge was. In adapting the thought and forms of the Latin West, the Kiev Metropolitanate proved that it possessed the inner resources to reform rather than to disintegrate. Latin philosophical texts, Church Slavonic grammars, and Polish-language polemical works were components of this response. Although Latin accretions and internal inconsistencies were part of the religious culture of the period, Ukrainian or Ruthenian religious practice, both Orthodox and Uniate, represented more a synthesis of the long contact of the Kiev Metropolitanate with the West than it did a collection of disparate and contradictory religious practices. From the heights of Kievan theology to the popular Christmas carols, the Ukrainians accepted outside influences without losing their religious and cultural heritage. In the Ukraine, there were no religious schisms or divisions such as the Raskol in Russia over the introduction of new

forms. Even those who objected to western influences, the polemicist Ivan Vyshens'kyi or the trans-Dnieper monks, were usually too familiar with the 'other' to be able to expurgate it from their own thought or to avoid it in totality. The division within the Ukrainian community came over a more substantive issue—union with Rome and a change of faith. Although both Orthodox and Uniate Ukrainians have undergone periodic movements to diminish Latin and Western Christian influence on their religious culture, the Westernisation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is so deeply imbedded in their religious tradition that it cannot be uprooted.¹⁴

Most Eastern Christians have followed the models pioneered in the Ukraine. Kievan learning served as the model for the entire eighteenth-century Russian Imperial Church. Ukrainian music and art, through its importation to Russia, later spread throughout the Orthodox world. Experiments in employing the vernacular in sixteenth-century Ukraine and Belorussia were later to be repeated among other Orthodox peoples. Even when other Orthodox and Eastern Christian peoples did not directly import elements of the Ukrainian synthesis, they frequently underwent analogous processes later.¹⁵

The active role of the laity constitutes a second enduring tradition in Ukrainian church life. Laymen became involved in church affairs and spiritual life and new institutions emerged. The form that the Uniate Church took at the end of the seventeenth century and the remaking of the Orthodox Church in the Ukraine in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries undermined this role of the laity and lay organisations, but new circumstances have frequently caused a revival of earlier traditions and institutions.

Laymen were essential to the administration and preservation of the Orthodox Kiev Metropolitanate. In the sixteenth century, the endangered church turned to great patrons, such as Prince Konstantyn Ostroz'kyi, to ensure its protection. Nobles, endowed with the sweeping rights of the nobiliary Commonwealth, not only served as patrons and protectors of local churches, but also spoke in the name of the church at Diets and took part in the synods of the Orthodox Church in the early seventeenth century. Burghers had organised their own reform of church and community activities, even exercising the right to dismiss their clergymen. Zaporozhian Cossacks had not only assumed protection over the new Orthodox hierarchy, but also intervened in religious councils. The urban brotherhoods or *bratstva*, enrolling burghers, as well as nobles and Cossacks, constituted the

most creative response to religious and cultural problems in the Ukraine and Belorussia. They also signified how greatly Ruthenian religious culture had diverged from other Eastern Christian communities. This can be seen by the need of the Lviv burghers to explain what a brotherhood was to seventeenth-century Russians.¹⁶

Clergymen resented some lay interventions in religious affairs as contrary to traditional canons and as undermining the position of the clergy.¹⁷ Some were attracted to the Union as a way of restoring full clerical control of the church. The defection of the metropolitan and five bishops increased the importance of the laity, who came to realise that they, not the hierarchs, remained steadfast in preserving the church. Twenty years of church life without a complete hierarchy (1596–1620) were followed by twelve years of governance by hierarchs who often could not take up residence in their sees and depended on the Orthodox nobles, Cossacks, and burghers to support their positions against a government that viewed them as illegal. Even after 1632, Metropolitan Mohyla, who sought to reassert clerical leadership in church affairs, had to depend on the noble laity. After 1648, the higher clergymen might find the Cossacks troublesome protectors, but they could not deny the benefits Cossack successes had brought for the church and they could not avoid adaptation to a new order in which priests and Cossack administrators not only represented dual powers, but were often members of the same families.

In the early seventeenth century, the need to compete for supporters also influenced the Uniate Church to pay heed to the laity. However, as it lost the support of the great nobles, major brotherhoods, and the Cossacks, the Uniate Church, influenced by Roman practices, reduced the role of the laity. Ultimately, it turned to laymen not its members, Latin-rite Catholic nobles, to strengthen its position.

A third element of the religious experience of the age was the 'nationalisation' of the church and the articulation of a subjective Ruthenian national consciousness based on the view of the church as properly a national institution.¹⁸ The church had always been the Ruthenian Church, the embodiment of the conversion of the Rus' rulers and their people in the tenth century. By the sixteenth century, new conditions deepened the nation-bearing character of the church. The extinction of Rus' dynasties and polities made the church the only direct institutional link to Kievan Rus'. The assimilation of many members of the secular elite to Polish culture, accompanied by

religious conversions, augmented the role of the church as a spokesman for the Ruthenian tradition. Polish penetration of the Ukraine, the development of a Polish vernacular literature and concept of nation, and the deprecation and later persecution of Orthodoxy by Polish clerical leaders and authorities combined to intensify national-religious feeling, in which the Ruthenian people and the Ruthenian church were viewed as one. The church not only embodied the national identity, it also frequently used the Ruthenian language in administration and publications, albeit without advocating the abandonment of Slavonic. All these factors heightened Ruthenian national feeling and the identification of the church as the suprastructure of 'Ruthenian nationhood'. The mix of religious and national sentiment was especially apparent in the organisation of brotherhoods among the burghers, since the Ruthenian burghers, subject to discrimination, developed an intense ethno-religious sentiment in an environment in which they competed with other ethno-religious communities, Polish Catholics, Armenians and Jews.

Even the Union of Brest, which divided the Ruthenians, worked to intensify the identification as both sides strove that all Ruthenians should be one in faith. At the same time, however, it favoured more sophisticated thinking on Ruthenian national identity since suddenly church and 'nation' were not coterminous and polemicists had to discuss the religious divide within the Ruthenian people. The essence of the debate was the historical question of which faith Volodymyr (Vladimir) had accepted. Therefore, in the Ukraine, it inspired knowledge of the Kievan Rus' past as the cradle of Ruthenian national and religious culture. Even the Protestants occasionally invoked Volodymyr and the conversion as a means of securing legitimacy. While each church could deny the other's legitimacy, it could not deny that there were Ruthenians of another religious persuasion. Orthodox might still see themselves as part of a greater Orthodox world, but they clearly viewed themselves as part of a Ruthenian (or after the mid-seventeenth century Ukrainian or Little Rus') division of that world both as an ecclesiastical and a historico-linguistic community. After 1596, they also had to integrate into their world view the adherence of fellow Ruthenians to Rome. At least the intellectuals, men like Meletii Smotryts'kyi and Adam Kysil, articulated these issues, and Smotryts'kyi argued that conversion did not mean a change of nationality since blood, not religion, defined nationality.¹⁹ The concepts were amorphous, and the unstable political and religious situation prevented their crystallisation, but

Ukrainians had begun the discussions of religious, national and cultural issues that have continued to the present. In modern times, Ukrainians frequently invested the church with the national significance it assumed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, especially when other potential national institutions were abolished or usurped.

A fourth tradition, or rather experience, of the churches in Ukraine was that of accommodation or conflict of churches with state powers. The relations of a number of political entities (the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the Cossack Hetmanate, the Ottoman Empire, the Crimean Khanate, Muscovy/the Russian Empire) with the two Ruthenian churches were diverse and frequently contradictory. In general, however, the leaders of both churches of the Kiev Metropolitanate found that their church structure and religious traditions had to be restructured to adjust to political rulers. Political power has determined much in Ukrainian religious history. Desire to obtain political influence and to find favour with the ruler to a considerable degree explains the Union of Brest. Weak central government in the Commonwealth and successful utilisation of internal (Prince Ostroz'kyi, the Zaporozhian Cossacks) and external (the Ottomans, Muscovy, the Eastern patriarchates) centres of power explain the reason for the survival of the Orthodox Church. Ultimately, however, the Orthodox Church could only ensure long-term existence by coming to terms with king and state—whether through the compromise of 1632 or the ostensible willingness to discuss a new union. In like manner, the Uniate Church survived assaults by Cossacks, nobles and burghers because it had advocates in the government of the Commonwealth, kings and senators, as well as Vatican nuncios who influenced government policy.

Changes in political structures posed great problems and opportunities for the churches of the Kiev Metropolitanate. Had Polish control of Moscow continued or Wladyslaw's candidacy to the Muscovite throne succeeded during the Time of Troubles, the Union would certainly have expanded beyond the Kiev Metropolitanate to the Patriarchate of Moscow. In contrast, the Cossack revolts and the Khmel'nyts'kyi uprising endangered the very existence of the Uniate Church. Paradoxically, the uprising posed problems for the Orthodox Church, which it actively supported. Most of the Orthodox hierarchs viewed rebellion with discomfort, particularly after the church obtained legal recognition in 1632, and were suspicious of the Cossack leaders as new political masters. They also feared that the political division of territories of the Kiev Metropolitanate would

undermine its ecclesiastical unity and that the revolt would weaken the position of the church in the lands that remained in the Commonwealth. Metropolitan Kosov foresaw that Khmel'nyts'kyi's turn to Muscovy and oath of allegiance to the tsar would bring undesirable consequences for the church—above all the transfer of the Kiev Metropolitanate from the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople to that of Moscow.

In the second half of the seventeenth century, metropolitans and bishops strove for stability amidst an unstable political situation. Uniate hierarchs sought to avoid the consequences of political compromises, such as the Union of Hadiach, which were deleterious to the interests of their church. Ultimately, the division of Ukraine between the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and Muscovy (1667, 1686) and the rise of Catholic intolerance in the Commonwealth worked to the Uniates' advantage. By the beginning of the eighteenth century the sees of Peremyshl', Lviv, and Luts'k accepted the Union and the real foundations of the Uniate Church were laid in the Ukrainian territories controlled by Poland.

The Orthodox clergymen and Metropolitanate had greater options and more diverse constituencies. Metropolitan Kosov sought to come to an accommodation with the Polish-Lithuanian authorities and to minimize the effect of the Pereiaslav Agreement, while Metropolitan Dionisii Balaban supported Vyhovs'kyi's policy of reintegrating the Ukraine into the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as the Duchy of Rus'. Bishops Metodii Fylymovych and Lazar Baranovych adjusted to the influence of the Muscovite Church and state in the Ukraine, even at the price of undermining the unity of the Kiev Metropolitanate. In general, all the Orthodox churchmen found that the church must eventually accommodate to political power, though the period contained many examples of attempts to avoid this hard reality. Still the subordination of the Kiev Metropolitanate to Moscow in 1686, the loss of the western Ukrainian dioceses to the Uniates, and the church's anathema of its great patron Ivan Mazepa in 1708 revealed how political power would draw ecclesiastical boundaries and determine the role of the church.

Ultimately the failure to establish a political entity uniting the Ukrainian territories undermined the position of the local Orthodox Church. In the late sixteenth century, suggestions were made that the patriarch of Constantinople should migrate to Ukrainian territories, and in the early seventeenth century various plans envisaged Kiev as the centre of a patriarchate. Mohyla made Kiev one of the major

seats of the Orthodox world, and in the seventeenth century it appeared that the Kiev metropolitans might see the prestige of their church raised by the formation of a new Orthodox state on their territory. That possibility receded rapidly after 1660.

Both Orthodox and Uniate churches were reorganised along the lines of dominance of Moscow-St Petersburg and Warsaw in the Ukraine in the eighteenth century. By the early eighteenth century, the Orthodox metropolitan residing in Kiev had lost most of his Metropolitanate's faithful controlled by Poland to the Uniates, while the diocese of Chernihiv, though part of the Hetmanate, was subordinated directly to the Moscow Patriarchate. Kiev might still be the home of great monasteries and churches, but the Kiev Metropolitanate had been dismantled and by the end of the eighteenth century even the particular practices of the Ukrainian Church were largely abolished. In the Polish-controlled territories, the Kiev Metropolitan's Uniate competitor could only use Kiev in his title but not reside in the city. His large church in the Belorussian-Ukrainian territories was to a considerable degree Latinized and Polonized. The Uniate Church not only lost the upper classes to the Latin-Rite, but also lost much of its active self-identification as a Ruthenian national church that had inspired the formulators of the Union. In the eighteenth century it became the instrument for binding Ukrainians and Belorussians to the Commonwealth that some had hoped it would be in the late sixteenth century.²⁰

A fifth tradition of Ukrainian church affairs of the period was the emergence of a religious, literary, and artistic culture that was specifically Ukrainian rather than Ruthenian or Belorussian-Ukrainian. The centrality of the church, clergymen and religious themes in intellectual and cultural pursuits permeated early modern Ukrainian culture. Indeed, religious culture influenced even secular cultural expression such as administrative buildings, portraiture, or political tracts, since the clergymen and church schools controlled education. Political, economic and social changes advanced the formation of new Ukrainian cultural models in the seventeenth century. The process, associated with the nationalisation of the church as Ruthenian, had begun in the fifteenth century. By the late sixteenth century, the common Belorussian-Ukrainian religious and secular culture had come to centre more and more in the Ukrainian territories as assimilation and conversion progressed more rapidly in the Belorussian territories. The political divide of the 'Ruthenian' lands at the Union of Lublin (1569) advanced the differentiation of

Belorussian and Ukrainian cultures. In the early seventeenth century, the political border to some degree mirrored religious divisions, as the Ukrainian territories became the stronghold of Orthodoxy. More importantly, the religious institutions of Kiev and Lviv, the nobles, burghers and Cossacks of the Ukrainian lands, and the Cossack Hetmanate afforded new patrons and consumers of religious and secular culture.²¹

By the second half of the seventeenth century, a religious culture that can be called Ukrainian rather than Ruthenian Orthodox had emerged. The limitation of the Kiev metropolitan's title to 'Little Rus'' after the Pereiaslav Agreement and the Muscovite Church's claims to control Belorussia reflected the predominantly Ukrainian nature of the church. In the new political and social environment of the Ukraine, new literary and artistic forms emerged that have been called Cossack and Ukrainian Baroque. Histories such as Archimandrite Feodosii Sofonovych's *Kroinika* traced the history of the Ukraine at the same time the new Cossack elite provided patronage for art and music.²² By the end of the century a specifically Ukrainian cultural model had matured. Centred in Kiev, the Cossack Hetmanate, and Sloboda Ukraine, this 'national' cultural style drew on the general Ruthenian tradition and continued to influence, and be influenced by, developments in the western Ukrainian and Belorussian territories. Just as the Ukrainian Church and political entities were absorbed in the Russian Church and Russian Empire, so this culture was absorbed into Imperial Russian culture by the end of the eighteenth century. However, the existence of a national Ukrainian culture closely allied with the church and religious culture provided an enduring example for relations between church and culture and for styles in Ukrainian religious art, architecture and music for subsequent generations.

A sixth tradition of the period was the formation of two churches—Orthodox and Catholic—that share the same religious culture. Both groups not only developed out of the church of St Volodymyr, but they were also formed from similar influences and conditions in the century before and after the Union of Brest. Locked in heated combat, they were always aware that they were essentially one church and one tradition, distinct not only from Western churches, but also from other Eastern churches. The Uniate Ruthenians did not easily fit into the norms and practices of the Roman Church. The Orthodox had too fully imbibed the influences of the West and the political-social conditions of the Ukraine to feel comfortable among

other Orthodox churches. Institutions, men, books, practices and ideas passed from one group to the other in this formative period of modern Ukrainian religious life. Catholic coreligionists have distrusted the Uniates' Catholicism just as the Orthodox have been suspicious of the full Orthodoxy of Ukrainian believers. They have had some cause to do so since shared Ukrainian religious characteristics and consciousness have waxed and waned, but never died out. In this way they have produced a certain internal Ukrainian ecumenism despite confessional differences.

The first century after the Union of Brest, when both churches had salient national characteristics and even consciousness, was a time when that which united the two churches seemed very real. Such characteristics, so often troubling to religiously homogeneous neighbours, give an especially modern ring to many statements of the age. Consider the declaration of Adam Kysil, before an Orthodox synod composed of clergymen and laymen calling for conciliation between Orthodox and Uniates in 1629:

Gentlemen, you are not the only ones to weep. We all weep at the sight of the rent coat and precious robe of our dear Mother the Holy Eastern Church. You, Gentlemen, bemoan, as do we all, that we are divided from our brethren, we who were in one font of the Holy Spirit six hundred years ago in the Dnieper waters of this metropolis of the Rus' Principality. It wounds you, Gentlemen, and it wounds us all. Behold! There flourish organisms of commonwealths composed of various nations, while we of one nation, of one people, of one religion, of one worship, of one rite, are not as one. We are torn asunder, and thus we decline.²³

Throughout this period striving for the reunification of the Kievan Metropolitanate continued. Acceptance that two religious groups would arise where only one had existed came only slowly. Although subsequent divergence in religious culture and traditions has made the existence of Orthodox and Uniate believers among Ukrainians less difficult to accept, the continued instability in relations between the two groups derives in part from awareness of their common origins and shared characteristics. Consequently, each group finds the existence of the other more troubling than it finds the existence of Roman Catholics, Protestants or Greek and Russian Orthodox. Frequently, however, the two groups have found that the bond of shared religious culture and national loyalties is so strong that

denominational affiliations are set aside.

A seventh tradition that arose in the period was an elevation of the Ukrainian churches to more than local significance. The Union of Brest constituted the largest lasting union of Eastern Christians with Rome and brought the Ukrainian and Belorussian territories to the attention of a wider Christian community. It served as a model for unionising efforts among the Ukrainians of Hungary and the Armenians of the Commonwealth. Clergymen active in promoting the Union, such as Metodii Terlets'kyi, used their experience in the Balkans. In discussions of how to gain acceptance of the Union, programmes for the erection of a patriarchate in Kiev only loosely affiliated with Rome were formed. Although these plans were never realised, they constituted a discussion of the structure of the Catholic church that challenged the model of post-Tridentine Catholicism. The eastern patriarchs and the Muscovite Church were vitally interested in the church in the Kiev Metropolitanate. They sought to keep it Orthodox and to draw upon its intellectual and institutional resources. The Kiev collegium made the Ukraine a major centre of religious and intellectual culture.

Although the Ukrainian churches have never again occupied as important a place in the Christian community as they did in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, the experiments and plans of this age have inspired important modern spiritual leaders and church movements. Metropolitan Ruts'kyi served as a model of a Uniate hierarch with a broad vision of the relation between Eastern and Western churches for Andrei Sheptyts'kyi. Peter Mohyla provided an example for making Kiev the centre of a reformed, reinvigorated, virtually independent local Orthodox Church for Vasyl' Lypkivs'kyi. Indeed the modern religious leaders could even draw inspiration from religious figures who did not share their confessional adherence, but who had led the Ukrainian Church at a time it played a role of international importance.

The seven traditions outlined are but one manner of assessing the significance of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in modern Ukrainian religious culture. All are not of equal importance, and each is but a means to analyse the rich Ukrainian religious experience of the early modern period. Other 'traditions' can surely be added. However the components of the religious culture of the age are described, the picture will remain the same. Ukrainian religious culture went through major changes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that have shaped the Ukrainian religious experience

throughout the remainder of its first millennium and will continue to do so well into its second.

NOTES

1. The Russian original of *Puti russkogo bogosloviia* (Paris: 1937) has been translated into English, *The Ways of Russian Theology*, ed. Richard S. Haugh, part 1, *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*, v (Belmont, Mass.: 1979). See my discussion of Florovsky's views on the Ukrainian church in 'Recent Western Views on Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian Culture', in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, VIII, 1/2 (Cambridge, Mass.: June 1984) pp. 156–87.
2. The standard positive evaluation of this period is I. Vlasov's'kyi, *Narys istorii Ukraïns'koï pravoslavnoi tserkvy*, 4 vols in 5 books (New York: 1955–66). The first two volumes, which cover the church's history until the end of the seventeenth century, have appeared in an abridged English translation, I. Wlasowsky, *Outline History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*, 2 vols) (New York-South Bound Brook, NJ: 1974–79).
3. The best general treatment of the cultural achievements of this period is M. Hrushevs'kyi, *Kul'turno-natsional'nyi rukh na Ukraïni XVI–XVII st.*, 2nd ed., n.p. (1919). For the literary production of the period, see *Ukraïns'ki pys'mennyky. Bio-bibliohrafichni slovnyk. I Davnia Ukraïns'ka literatura (XI–XVII st.)*, comp. L. Makhnovets' (Kiev: 1960).
4. For interpretations of Ukrainian religious traditions, see D. Doroshenko, *Pravoslavna tserkva v mynulomu i suchasnomu zhytti Ukraïns'koho narodu* (Berlin: 1940); N. Polons'ka-Vasylenko, *Istorychni pidvalyny UAPTs* (Rome: 1964); V. Lypyns'kyi, *Religiia i tserkva v istorii Ukraïni* (Philadelphia: 1925); *Relihiia v zhytti Ukraïns'koho narodu*, Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva im. Shevchenka, CLXXXI (Munich-Rome-Paris: 1966).
5. The most comprehensive work on the Roman Catholic church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth is *Kościół w Polsce*, ed. J. Kłóczowski, n.p. (1969), II. The most recent study on Protestants in the Ukraine in this period is G. Williams, 'Protestants in the Ukraine in the Period of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth' (*Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, II, 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: March 1978) pp. 41–72; II, 2 (June 1978) pp. 184–210). Also see M. Hrushevs'kyi, *Z istorii religiinoï dumky na Ukraïni* (Lviv: 1925).
6. On the Union of Brest, see the standard work by E. Likowski, *Unia Brzeska (1596)* (Poznan: 1896), available in German and Ukrainian translations. Also see O. Halecki, *From Florence to Brest (1439–1596)*, for the period before the union. J. Macha, *Ecclesiastical Unification: A*

Theoretical Framework together with Case Studies from the History of Latin-Byzantine Relations, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, cxcviii (Rome: 1974), is an excellent discussion of church life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

7. Fortunately there is a bibliography for the large literature on Ukrainian church history of this period, I. Patrylo, *Dzherela i bibliohrafiia istoriia Ukraïns'koi tserkvy*, *Analecta OSBM*, series 2, section 1, xxxiii, and the addendum *Analecta OSBM*, x (Rome: 1979) pp. 405–87. In this article only a few general works are included in the notes, as well as items not included in Patrylo's bibliography, primarily because they are too recent. The basic works on Ukrainian church history are Vlasovs'kyi, *Narys*, A. Velykyi, *Z litopysu Khrystyians'koi Ukraïny*, vols 4–6 (Rome: 1971–73); M. Harasiewicz, *Annales Ecclesiae Ruthenae* (Lviv: 1862); H. Luzhnyts'kyi, *Ukraïns'ka tserkva mizh Skhodem i Zakhodem. Narys istorii Ukraïns'koi tserkvy* (Philadelphia: 1954), and L. Bienkowski, 'Organizacja Kosciola Wschodniego w Polsce' in *Kościół w Polsce*, pp. 733–1050. Important works in East Slavic church history are A. Ammann, *Abriss der Ostslavischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna: 1950), A. Kartashev, *Ocherki po istorii Russkoi tserkvi*, 2 vols (Paris: 1959); and Makarii (Bulgakov), *Istoriia Russkoi tserkvi*, 12 vols (St Petersburg: 1864–86).
8. J. Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: 1981) examines ecclesiastical affairs.
9. K. Chodynicki, *Kościół Prawosławny a Rzeczypospolita Polska 1370–1632* (Warsaw: 1934) deals with church-state relations.
10. Thanks to S. Golubev, *Kievskii Mitropolit Petr Mogila i ego spodvizhnyki (Opyt tserkovno-istoricheskogo issledovaniia)*, 2 vols (Kiev: 1883–98) this is one of the best studied periods in Ukrainian church history. See also the special issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* on Mohyla and the Kiev Academy, viii, 1/2 (1984) in particular I. Ševčenko, 'The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla'. On government policy, see J. Dziągiewski, *Polityka wyznaniowa Władysława IV* (Warsaw: 1985).
11. For Orthodox church history in the late seventeenth century, see N. Carynnyk-Sinclair, *Die Unterstellung der Kiever Metropolie unter das Moskauer Patriarchat* (Munich: 1970).
12. Although Velykyi's, *Litopys*, is a publication of radio lectures, it is derived from extensive study and editing of sources in the Basilian *Analecta*. Until a more scholarly history of the Uniate Church is written, it remains the best comprehensive account.
13. On toleration in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, see J. Tazbir, *A State without Stakes: Polish Religious Tolerance in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Warsaw: 1973).
14. On the convergence of cultural traditions, see E. Winter, *Byzanz und Rom im Kampfe um die Ukraine: 955–1939* (Leipzig: 1942).
15. This question has been little explored recently, and K. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikoruskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'* (Kazan': 1914) remains the basic study in the field.

16. On the brotherhoods, see Ia. Isaievych, *Bratstva ta ikh rol' v rozvytku ukrains'koi kul'tury XVI–XVII st.* (Kiev: 1966).
17. For an argument that the role of the laity in this period was a complete innovation resisted by the clergy, see V. Zaikin, *Uchastie svetskogo elementa v tserkovnom upravlenii, vyborne nachalo i sobornost' v Kievskoi mitropolii v XVI–XVII v.* (Warsaw: 1930).
18. On national consciousness in this period, see T. Chynczewska-Hennel, *Świadomość narodowa kozaczyzny i szlachty ukraińskiej w XVII wieku* (Warsaw: 1985).
19. For Smotryts'kyi's works as well as an introduction and bibliography by D. Frick, see *The Works of Meletij Smotryc'kyi*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: Texts 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: 1987). On Kysil, see F. Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil 1600–1653* (Cambridge, Mass.: 1985).
20. The relations of the Orthodox and Uniate churches and the political entities that controlled the Ukraine remain poorly studied. M. Chubatyi, 'Pro pravne stanovishche terkvy v kozats'kyi derzhavi', in *Bohosloviia*, III (Lviv: 1925) pp. 156–87 remains the only general study on the Hetmanate.
21. The issue of national style has been best studied in art and architecture. See P. Bilets'kyi, *Ukrains'kyi portretnyi zhyvopys XVII–XVIII st.: Problemy stanovlennia i rozvytku* (Kiev: 1969).
22. For a discussion of Sofonovych's work as well as cultural processes in early modern Ukraine, see F. Sysyn, 'The Cultural, Social and Political Context of Ukrainian History-Writing in the Seventeenth Century', in G. Brogi Bercoff (ed.), *Dall'Opus Oratorium alla Ricerca Documentaria: La Storiografia polacca, ucraina e russa fra il XVI e il XVIII secolo*, Europa Orientalis, v (Rome: 1986) pp. 285–310.
23. Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine*, p. 61.