

*The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla**

To be in Kiev during the almost twenty years that Metropolitan Peter Mohyla (in Romanian, Movilă) enjoyed ascendancy in that city (1627–1646) must have been a heady experience for many a soul. The Orthodox at large were witnessing the rebirth of their Greek religion and of their Rus' nation. Select groups among them—teachers and students of Mohyla's school of higher learning, or *collegium*, well-established parents who were sending their sons there, printers and editors at the press in the Caves Monastery, of which Mohyla was archimandrite—could feel that they were playing an important part in that rebirth. Some helped by teaching, supporting, or learning the new “sciences,” others by enlisting modern technology in the service of a sacred cause. In several quarters, spirits were uplifted and minds were expanding.

The present essay is devoted to these two lively and optimistic decades in Kiev's intellectual life. It will deal with the early years of Mohyla and of his educational enterprise; with the intellectual horizons of the metropolitan and of the students in his newly created *collegium* in Kiev; and with the attitude the *collegium* and its founder displayed toward the Polish Commonwealth and the Cossacks. Only occasionally shall we touch upon the subsequent history and influence of Mohyla's *collegium*, which was elevated to the rank of an academy at the end of the seventeenth century. I shall, however, close with some remarks on the contribution of Mohyla's school to the growth of Ukrainian historical and national consciousness.

I

The Kievan Theophany *bratstvo*, a religious confraternity of laymen and clergy, was founded in 1615. It obtained the rank of a *stauropegion*—that is,

* This essay originally appeared in *The Kiev Mohyla Academy*, a special issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (vol. 8, no. 1/2, June 1984), pp. 9–44. It has also been reprinted in I. Ševčenko, *Byzantium and the Slavs in Letters and Culture* (Cambridge, Mass., and Naples, 1991), pp. 651–87.

a foundation under the direct protection of the patriarch of Constantinople—through a charter issued in 1620 by Theophanes, the patriarch of Jerusalem, who acted as Constantinople’s plenipotentiary. The same charter sanctioned the confraternity’s school, which it called a school of Helleno-Slavonic and—significantly—Latin scripture. The year 1620, which saw the “illegal” reestablishment of an Orthodox hierarchy in Ukraine and Belarus’ by the same Theophanes, was thus also a milestone in educational development in Kiev. The corresponding secular privilege for the confraternity was issued by the Polish king, Sigismund (Zygmunt) III, in 1629.

The directorship of the confraternity school was an important post; it was held by people drawn from the ranks of the Orthodox intellectual elite. Iov Borec'kyj, the first metropolitan of Kiev in the restored hierarchy of 1620, was director between 1615 and 1619 and a supporter of the school until his death in 1631. Other prominent intellectuals—both laymen and ecclesiastics—among the officers of the school were Vasyly' Borec'kyj (the jurist), Meletij Smotryc'kyj, Kasijan Sakovyč, and Zaxarij Kopystens'kyj, archimandrite of the Kievan Caves Monastery. Such was the state of Orthodox education in Kiev when Peter Mohyla (born in the 1590s) appeared on the scene, intent on strengthening and broadening the new concepts that were already making their way in that education.

Mohyla (in Romanian, *Movilă* means “hill” or “mountain”) came from a family of Moldavian hospodars. Moldavia originally depended ecclesiastically on Halyč, and when the Poles, as successors to the Halyč principality, extended their protectorate over Moldavia (by then inhabited by speakers of a Romanian dialect), they insisted on maintaining Moldavia’s ecclesiastical dependence on Halyč. Despite the establishment (in 1401) of a separate Moldavian metropolitan see, with its seat in Suceava (Sučava), Moldavia remained in touch with western Rus', partly because its vassalage to Poland was renewed (1402) and partly because in Moldavia, the main language of administration and of the church was Slavonic—a vehicle that continued to be used (if to a lesser extent as time progressed) into the eighteenth century in official acts and in contacts with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Polish, too, was introduced in Moldavia. The treaties of 1519 and 1527 between King Sigismund I and Hospodar Stephen (Ștefan) were written in Polish, as was some of the correspondence of the L'viv burghers and the L'viv confraternity with the hospodars. Ruthenian played a part in this correspondence as well: for instance, Symeon Mohyla (Simion Movilă), Peter’s father, wrote to the L'viv confraternity in that language. Religious polemical literature of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, written in Ruthenian and Polish, also reached Moldavia, largely through the L'viv confraternity. In turn, many hospodars were benefactors of the confraternity, as they were of other Orthodox establishments outside their frontiers, for instance, the monasteries

of Mount Athos and the Monastery of St. Catherine near Mt. Sinai.

In 1593, the Mohyla family was granted the rights of indigenous nobility in the Commonwealth. In 1595, Jeremiah Mohyla (Ieremia Movilă) became a vassal hospodar of Poland, as did his brother Symeon. Symeon's son, Peter, spent his early childhood in Moldavia, where he learned the rudiments of reading and writing in Slavonic. When Symeon Mohyla's fortunes declined in Moldavia, he moved his family to Poland. Although little is known about Peter Mohyla's childhood education in Poland, it is likely that he received elementary training in grammar at the L'viv confraternity school. After completing his initial studies, he may have studied at one of the Jesuit academies, either in Vilnius or Zamość.¹ The poorly documented speculation among scholars to the effect that Peter Mohyla received a university education at the Sorbonne in Paris or elsewhere in France seems to be based on a misunderstanding.² In any case, by the year 1617 he held an appointment at the court of Crown Hetman Stanisław Żółkiewski; in 1621 he took part in the battle of Xotyn (Chocim) against the Turks alongside the victorious Lithuanian hetman, Jan Karol Chodkiewicz. He then moved to Ukraine, bought landed property near Kiev, and entered monastic orders at the city's Caves Monastery in 1625.

In spite of their Western background and friendly stance toward Poland, the Mohyla family, including Peter, were ardent supporters of Orthodoxy. Sometime after 1628, when Mohyla finally became archimandrite of the Caves Monastery, he set about establishing a school there. He intended to create an institution that would keep Eastern Orthodoxy unsullied and would teach it properly, and yet avoid the shortcomings of the confraternity schools. Instruction at his school was to attain the level of Western—which, in practical terms, meant Polish—education, and thus would make it unnecessary to send Orthodox youth to the West in search of learning. In short, his school at the Caves Monastery was to be not so much Helleno-Slavonic as Latino-Polish in character. That made his enterprise suspect to Orthodox zealots.

In 1631, to avoid Orthodox attacks, Mohyla secured the blessing of the patriarch of Constantinople for the foundation of what a contemporary witness described as a school of Latin and Polish sciences. When instruction began

1. S. Golubev, *Kievskij mitropolit Petr Mogila i jego spodvižniki*, pt. 1, vol. 1 (Kiev, 1883), p. 19; F. A. Ternovskij, "Kievskij mitropolit Petr Mogila—biografičeskij očerk," *Kievskaja starina* 2 (April 1882): 2.

2. J. Michalcescu, ed., *Ἐθναυρὸς τῆς Ὀρθοδοξίας. Die Bekenntnisse und die wichtigsten Glaubenszeugnisse der gr.-orientalischen Kirche im Originaltext....* (Leipzig, 1904), p. 22; C. Erbiceanu, "Petru Movilă," *Biserică Ortodoxă Română* 33 (1909): 539. Cf., in the last place, O. Bilodid, "Zahadka Petra Mohyly," *Kyiv'ska starovyna* 3 [300] (May-June 1993): 56–69, esp. pp. 62–63.

in the fall of the same year for more than one hundred pupils in the new school, located near the Caves Monastery, Kiev's Orthodox zealots spread rumors about what was being taught there and the school's teachers were accused of pro-Uniate leanings. This upset the lower classes, and when the accusations and rumors reached the Cossacks, both Mohyla himself and his teachers were apparently threatened with death for introducing Latin and Polish in the school. As one of the school's teachers (and a future metropolitan of Kiev), Syl'vestr Kosov, said in his *Exegesis* of 1635, Mohyla's opponents intended to stuff the sturgeons of the Dnieper with the teachers of the school—a tidbit of information precious both to the intellectual historian and to the historical ichthyologist. Mohyla, negotiating skillfully, reached a compromise by agreeing to a fusion of the Caves Monastery's school with that of the Kiev confraternity, situated in Kiev's Podil district; the school was to function at the latter's location. The fusion, implemented during the school recess of 1632, is attested in several documents, two of which involve the Cossacks. In an important statement dated 12 March 1632 at Kaniv, the Cossack hetman, Ivan Petražyc'kyj, and the Zaporozhian Cossacks extended their protection over the school founded by Mohyla. In a letter of 17 March 1632, the hetman bade the Cossack *ataman* to support the union of the confraternity's school with that of Mohyla.³

The Latin character of the new school, offensive to the Orthodox zealots, was also repugnant to the Jesuits and to certain high officials of the crown—Vice-Chancellor Tomasz Zamoyski among them—who were unwilling to yield the monopoly in higher learning to the benighted Ruthenians. The Jesuits in particular, fearing competition for their own schools in Ukraine (their first educational establishment, in Kiev's Podil, dated from about 1620), exerted pressure on the government. Consequently, in 1634 King Władysław IV ordered Mohyla to abolish the Latin schools and Latin printing presses under his jurisdiction and to use the rights granted him “with moderation.”

Nevertheless, a year later (1635), the king confirmed Mohyla's school in Kiev, although not as an academy. It was to have no jurisdiction of its own, and no subjects higher than dialectic and logic—that is, no theology—were to be taught there. The king yielded on the point of Latin, however, and allowed liberal arts (*humaniora*) to be taught *in scholis Kijoviensibus...Graece*

3. For documents concerning the fusion, cf. *Pamjatniki izdannye Vremennoju komissieju dlja razbora drevnix aktov*, vol. 2 (Kiev, 1846), nos. 8–10, pp. 101–43. Petražyc'kyj's statement of 12 March 1632 was later confirmed by Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj and his son Jurij; cf. *ibid.*, p. 143. For Petražyc'kyj's letter of 17 March 1632, cf., e.g., *Pamjatniki izdannye Kievskoj komissieju dlja razbora drevnix aktov*, vol. 2, 2d ed. (Kiev, 1897), pp. 421–22, reprinted in A. Žukovs'kyj, *Petro Mohyla j pytannja jednosty cerkov* (see Bibliographic Note to the present essay), p. 216.

et Latine. Note the modest term *scholis*: apparently, an academy that would prepare an elite for service in Rus' was considered more disadvantageous to the policies of the Catholic state than a reestablished Orthodox hierarchy. The latter, it was continuously hoped, could be persuaded to join the union, especially if a Uniate patriarchate of Kiev were created and the patriarchal throne offered to Mohyla—a bait he refused to take, either in 1636 or in later years. Mohyla's dream of an academy was not to be fulfilled in his lifetime, and his school remained the *Collegium Kijoviense Mohileanum* until the end of the century. Nonetheless, it was the most important of the schools in Ukraine under Mohyla's supervision, which included that of Kremjanec' (Krzemieniec) in Volhynia and that of Vinnycja in the Braclav palatinate (the Vinnycja school was transferred to Hošča around 1640). In attempting to have his school named an academy, Mohyla sought to give it status equal to that of Jesuit schools like the Vilnius (Wilno) Academy. No wonder that Mohyla's *collegium* borrowed much from the Jesuit system—the enemy was to be fought with the enemy's weapons.

The *collegium's* chief administrators were a rector and a prefect. The rector was also the *hegumen* of the confraternity monastery of the Theophany, a position implying control over landed property; consequently, he was the *collegium's* top budgetary officer. The rector also taught philosophy and, in a later period, theology. The prefect was the inspector and administrator in charge of supplies and meals for the students; as an academic he taught rhetoric. The regular teachers were assisted by the more gifted pupils, called *auditores*, who both explained subjects to their fellow pupils before classes and supervised learning in the dormitory (*bursa*). In doing so, they were not only following Jesuit practice, but also continuing a medieval tradition; thus they were functioning somewhat as tutors in English colleges do today. Judging by later evidence dating from the 1730s, the student body of the Academy was recruited from all strata of the population: the son of a *sotnyk* (called *centurio* in the relevant documents) or of a priest would study next to the son of a smith or to sons of "a simple man."

Initially, the curriculum, patterned on the Jesuit model, took five years to complete. Its five classes were called *infima*, *grammatica*, *syntaxima*, class of poetics, and class of rhetoric. The first three consisted primarily of instruction in languages—Greek, Latin, Slavonic, and Polish—as well as in catechism, liturgical chant, and arithmetic. The poetics class taught what today we would call literary theory, literary genres, and mythology, important because every contemporary speech, poem, or other text had to be heavily seasoned with mythological allusions. Most of its textbooks on poetics date from a later

period, but two of them are early, from 1637 and 1646, respectively.⁴ Some of the textbooks were composed by famous personalities, for instance, Simeon Polacki and Feofan Prokopovyč. All manuals of poetics were written in Latin and Polish with examples drawn both from such classical writers as Martial and from the Polish-Latin poet Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski. Later textbooks drew liberally on Polish Renaissance and baroque poetry (Jan Kochanowski, Samuel Twardowski) for their examples.

In the class of rhetoric, students were taught the rules of composing speeches of congratulations or thanks, greetings, farewells, and funeral orations. The earliest textbook (based on lectures given in 1635/36) used examples culled both from Erasmus of Rotterdam and Stanisław Orzechowski. The most important such textbook, by Prokopovyč (1706), showed some anti-Polish cultural bias, but was written, like the overwhelming majority of Kiev manuals of rhetoric, in Latin. Staging plays on biblical subjects was among the students' extracurricular endeavors; at first, such plays were both composed and performed by pupils. This activity, again patterned on Jesuit practice, would continue and culminate in the "tragedokomedija" *Vladimerz*, composed by Prokopovyč and performed by Kiev students as a welcome to Hetman Mazepa in July 1702.

The class of dialectic trained students in scholastic disputations, an antiquated procedure consisting of questions and answers and subdivisions of the topic. Philosophy, which was taught in Latin and according to Aristotle (or his commentators), was subdivided into logic, physics, metaphysics, and ethics—again, hardly an innovative procedure, but one that followed the practice in most schools of the time. The course lasted three years. Its first textbook, composed by Josyf Kononovyč-Horbac'kyj for the courses conducted in 1639/40 (and still unpublished), was modestly called *Subsidium logicae*, perhaps reflecting the concern whether philosophy was a permissible subject, but the third, written by Innokentij Gizel' for his courses in 1646/47 (it, too, is still unpublished), was called, explicitly, *Opus totius philosophiae*. Its final section dealt with God and the angels, perhaps to compensate for the

4. On the textbook of 1637 by A. Starnovec'kyj and M. Kotozvars'kyj (known only in a copy of 1910, rediscovered in 1968), cf. V. I. Krekoten', "Kyjivs'ka poetyka 1637 roku," in *Literaturna spadščyna Kyjivs'koji Rusi i ukrajins'ka literatura XVI-XVIII st.* (Kiev, 1981), pp. 118–54; Ukrainian translation of the text, pp. 125–54. Cf. also *Radjans'ke literaturoznavstvo*, no. 10 (1970): 77; and I. Ivan'o, *Očerky razvittja èstetičeskoj mysli Ukraïny* (Moscow, 1981), pp. 77 and 83. On other textbooks, cf. R. Łuźny, *Pisarze kręgu Akademii Kijowsko-Mohylańskiej a literatura polska* (= *Zeszyty naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, 142, *Prace historyczno-literackie*, 11) (Cracow, 1966), pp. 22–107 (still the best); and D. S. Nalyvajko, "Kyjivs'ki poetyky XVII–počatku XVIII st. v konteksti jevropejs'koho literaturnoho procesu," in *Literaturna spadščyna*, pp. 155–95.

absence of a course in theology. To learn this latter sublime subject, gifted pupils were sent to Catholic academies in Vilnius and Zamość or even abroad.

II

Mohyla was consecrated metropolitan of Kiev with the approval of the Polish crown in 1633. In introducing reforms into the liturgical practices of his church, he championed the return *ad fontes*. The sources he had foremost in mind were Greek, even if some of them were located in the West—in Venice or even in England's Eton. He intended to have the *Lives of the Saints* translated into Slavic, and to have the result printed. For this purpose, he is said to have obtained from Mount Athos the Greek text of the Saints' *Lives* revamped in tenth-century Constantinople under the auspices of the high Byzantine official, Symeon called the Metaphrast. Death prevented Mohyla from carrying out this design. Its realization had to wait more than forty years until Dmytro Savyč Tuptalo's (Dmitrij Rostovskij's) *Čet'i Minei*, which began to appear in Kiev in 1689. Mohyla best expressed his postulate in the prefaces he wrote to the *Služebnyk* (*Book of Services*, or *Leiturgiarion*) of 1639 and to the *Trebnyk* (*Sacramentary*, or *Euchologion*) of 1646. The latter was the last work issued by the Kievan Caves Monastery press in his lifetime.

In the preface to the *Trebnyk* of 1646, the metropolitan fended off attacks from detractors of his publications and stressed the basic agreement between the Rus' and Greek sacramentaries.⁵ He also stated as one of his aims the elimination of errors contained in sacramentaries that had been printed in Vilnius, L'viv, and Ostrih at a time when there was no Orthodox hierarchy (i.e., before 1620) and when publishers were able to issue books merely for obtaining "ill-gotten gains." Such faulty books perpetuated old customs and old prejudices; for instance, they contained a prayer for the midwife who swaddled the infant Jesus. According to Mohyla, there was no authority in the New Testament for such a prayer: in passages devoted to the Nativity, the Evangelists implied that the Virgin Mary swaddled her son herself. What place did a midwife have here? This was correct as far as it went, but Mohyla disregarded early Christian apocryphal tradition.

Mohyla further declared that his *Trebnyk* provided a standard text based on the Greek sacramentary, and that this text was to supersede all others. In a

5. For the text of the preface, see Xv. Titov's *Materijaly dlja istoriji knyžnoji spravy na Vkrajinі v XVI-XVII vv.: Vsezbirka peredmov do ukrajins'kyx starodrukiv*, Ukrajins'ka akademiya nauk, Zbirnyk istoryčno-fililohičnoho viddilu, 17 (Kiev, 1924), pp. 367–73. Some material from Titov's text is reproduced in Žukovs'kyj's *Petro Mohyla j pytan'nja jednosty cerkov* (see Bibliographic Note below). Žukovs'kyj's book contains a good bibliography on Mohyla and on seventeenth-century Ukrainian church history.

play on words, he appealed to his readers to stop using the “useless” usage books (*ponexaj zažyvaty nepotrebnyc' z Trebnykov predrečennyx*), and he castigated those who continued to refer to such sacramentaries. In doing so he gave anticipatory evidence of the same attitude, purifying and renovating spirit, and professed reliance on Greek standards that Patriarch Nikon was to show in Muscovy some years later. No wonder: we know now that the Greek models invoked by Nikon in the initial stage of his reforms in fact largely consisted of Kievan printed texts, including those published in Mohyla's time.

For all such justified praise of the Greek as the appropriate source for improving Slavonic texts, the importance of Greek and Slavonic soon diminished in Kievan printing and education, and Mohyla's school became more and more latinized and polonized. There were valid reasons for the shift. By the middle of the seventeenth century, Greek was no longer a language of modern thought—which Church Slavonic had never been. The latter was taught because it was the language of Orthodox ecclesiastical texts. The right of the Orthodox to use Latin and Polish in their teaching continued to be challenged, however, not only by Orthodox zealots and by Catholics led by the Jesuits, but also by the Uniates. Mohyla had to reassert this right. In his *Lithos*, or *Stone* (1644), he admitted that the Rus' needed a knowledge of Greek and Church Slavonic for religious purposes. But for political activity, he claimed, they needed not only Polish, but also Latin, because the people of the lands under the Polish crown used Latin as if it were their mother tongue. In both chambers of parliament, in the courts, in dealings with the crown, in all political matters, Ruthenians, as crown citizens, should know both these languages if they were to function properly in the state. It would be neither right nor decorous for a Ruthenian to speak Greek or Slavonic before a member of the senate or diet (*Sejm*), for he would need an interpreter to accompany him wherever he went, and would be taken for a stranger or a simpleton. Even in explaining matters of faith, one should be able to give a reply in the language in which one is asked the question, that is, either in Latin proper or in Polish with ample Latin admixtures.⁶

Consequently, by 1649 Greek was taught at the Mohyla school only “in part” (*otčasti*). Such was the testimony of the notorious Paisios Ligarides (metropolitan of Gaza and for some time protégé of the patriarch of Jerusalem, also named Paisios), who was to play a nefarious role in the downfall of Nikon, the patriarch of Moscow, and who taught in the *collegium* for a time at a later date. Ligarides may have had a point. The preface to the *Eucharistērion*, the gratulatory tract presented to Mohyla in 1632 by the school's pupils, contains an error in Greek, and the Greek fresco inscriptions

6. *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii*, pt. 1, vol. 9 (Kiev, 1893), pp. 375–77.

of ca. 1643 in the Church of the Savior at Berestovo barely make sense.⁷ Even Mohyla's own writing of 1631 exhibits some imperfections in Greek, and only charity allows us to call them typographical errors. As for the Slavonic and Ruthenian languages, they must have been taught from local textbooks and dictionaries produced toward the end of the sixteenth century—such as Lavrentij Zyzanij's *Grammatika* and *Leksis* (both printed in Vilnius in 1596)—or issued in the period of the Kiev confraternity school: among such works were Meletij Smotryc'kyj's grammar of 1619 and Pamvo Berynda's *Leksikon slaveno-rosskij*, the latter published by the Caves Monastery in 1627.

Polish, more than Latin, was becoming the literary vehicle of the *collegium*, even at the printing house of the Caves Monastery. In 1645, Mohyla supplemented the Ruthenian edition of his abbreviated catechism with a Polish one, and the Polish edition was published first. What is more, two books sponsored by Mohyla and dealing with the virtues of, and miracles performed by, the monks of the Caves Monastery throughout its history (the *Paterikon* of 1635 by Syl'vestr Kosov, and the *Teratourgēma* of 1638 by Afanasij Kal'nofojs'kyj) were written in Polish. The preface to the latter includes allusions to Sallust's *Iugurtha* and to Apuleius, as well as some Latin words and quotations from Catullus, Seneca, and from the *Odes* of Horace.⁸ Thus, the future linguistic coloring of the *collegium* and, later, academy—which was to remain Latin and Polish until the middle of the eighteenth century, even under Russian domination—developed within a few years of its founding.

III

Mohyla's educational enterprise reflected the interplay of cultural forces in seventeenth-century Ukraine. The ancestral faith survived in borrowed forms, and admiration for the church poetry of a John of Damascus coexisted with predilection for the trappings of classical mythology. Mohyla's college was also what it was, however, because the man who created it was a man of many worlds. His experience and his contacts, as well as his plans, encompassed not only Warsaw, Cracow, and possibly other Polish or Western centers of learning, but also Jassy (Iași), Constantinople, and even, if to a

7. For the fresco inscriptions at Berestovo, see I. Ševčenko, *Byzantium and the Slavs in Letters and Culture* (Cambridge, Mass., and Naples, 1991), pp. 662 (n. 13) and 685 (fig. 2).

8. Cf. *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii*, pt. 1, vol. 8 (Kiev, 1914), p. 477; and Titov, *Materijaly*, p. 523. Cf. also the facsimile of the preface in *Seventeenth-Century Writings on the Kievan Caves Monastery* (= Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Texts, vol. 4) (Cambridge, Mass., 1987), pp. 122–31.

much lesser degree, Moscow. He could choose the level and language of discourse according to his addressee, and he combined a Jesuit's sophistication with an Orthodox believer's simple faith in miracles performed by his religion.

It is of some importance to study language use by the seventeenth-century Rus' elite. It appears that most members of that elite understood all four languages involved—Slavonic, Ruthenian, Polish, and Latin. Thus, no one language or style was the speaker's or writer's sole available vehicle for conveying a particular message. A choice was involved, and that choice indicated that person's cultural commitment or cultural position at a given moment. For example, to his brother Moses, hospodar of Moldavia, Mohyla wrote in almost pure Slavonic. The foreign quotations of his missive were all Greek, and all other quotations were scriptural. It is astonishing how well Mohyla mastered the Slavonic idiom, which he probably learned from teachers connected with the L'viv confraternity. The real concerns of the man and the time put a limit on his linguistic and conceptual mimicry, however. The missive's Slavonic, good as it was, contained words (such as *političeskaġ* and *ceremonii*) that were outside the Church Slavonic canon. In describing the duties of an ideal ruler to his brother, Mohyla was practising a genre used in the Byzantine world since at least the sixth century. In listing these duties, Mohyla proclaimed that his brother, being a ruler, was to be a benefactor of schools (*blahodĕtelju...učilišč byti*)—a statement that is hardly to be found in any mirror of princes addressed to a Byzantine emperor.⁹

Another set of Mohyla's Slavonic writings deals with miracles performed in his own time in the Orthodox church, not exclusively in Ukraine—for, after all, he was not a Ruthenian, but an Orthodox of many cultures—but also on Ukrainian territory. One such miracle occurred in the household of his own servant, Stanislav Tretjak. Tretjak had just built a house and asked Mohyla to consecrate it. This Mohyla did, and left some of the holy water behind. When he returned a year later, he was met by Tretjak and his wife, who had kept the water and claimed that it had changed into wine. Mohyla tasted it. The taste reminded him, he wrote, of Moldavian wine (*vkus aki voloskoho vina*), and he wanted to make sure that no mistake had occurred. After all, the son of a hospodar of Wallachia and Moldavia would know his Moldavian wines. When the couple swore that the change was miraculous, Mohyla accepted their word, took the holy water with him, and still had it at the time of writing. The water "had the bouquet and flavor of wine, and was not turning

9. For Mohyla's dedication of the *Pentĕkostarion* (*Cvĕtnaja Triodĭ*) of 1631 to Mojsej Mohyla, cf. Titov, *Materijaly*, pp. 263–66; and D. P. Bogdan, "Les enseignements de Pierre Movilă adressés à son frère Moïse Movilă," *Cyrrilomethodianum* 1 (1971): 1–25, esp. pp. 19–22.

to vinegar.”¹⁰

Stories such as this one must have been meant for all Orthodox, not only for those of Ukraine. When Mohyla addressed his own monks, Kiev churchgoers, or the clerics of his jurisdiction, as he did in his inaugural sermon pronounced at the Kievan Caves Monastery in March 1632, or in his prefaces to the *Služebnyk* of 1639 and to the *Trebnyk* of 1646, he wrote in Polonized Ukrainian, using such Polish words as *daleko barzěj* ‘much more,’ *pien'knaja* ‘beautiful,’ and *preložonyje* ‘superiors,’ but keeping the Ukrainian *ohon' musyt (byti)* ‘fire must be,’ *pyšučy* ‘writing,’ *ščo* ‘what,’ and *ščoby* ‘in order that.’ This mixed language also contained elements of Church Slavonic, if not quite authentic, appearance, as *jedinoutrobně* and *smotrěti*. Most scriptural quotations in the preface to the *Trebnyk* were in Church Slavonic, but some were in the Ruthenian literary language of the time, mixed with Slavonic.

When Mohyla addressed representatives of the Orthodox nobility, whether Bohdan Stetkevič, a Belarus' chamberlain, Teodor Proskura Suščans'kyj, a land-scribe of the Kiev palatinate, or Jarema Vyšnevec'kyj (Wiśniowiecki), a prince in danger of apostatizing from Orthodoxy, his Ruthenian language was heavily Polonized, his quotations were drawn from Latin church fathers Lactantius or St. Augustine, his Christian similes were heavily contaminated with bits of pagan wisdom, and his flattery was as artless as the recipient must have been indiscriminating. To Prince Vyšnevec'kyj, a relative, he wrote: “This venerable cross will be unto your princely grace what the mast was once unto Ulysses, which protected him from the Sirens, that is, the pleasures of this world.”¹¹ We must duly report that Mohyla's reference to Ulysses attached to the mast (a prefiguration of the cross) went back to Greek patristic literature of the fourth century. It is of more interest, however, to note that in naming the hero from Ithaca, he used the Latinizing *Ulessesovy*, rather than a derivative from the Greek *Odysseus*. And when Mohyla spoke about the ancestors of Teodor Proskura Suščans'kyj, a man whose young son—or, at least, relative—was a student at the *collegium*, he spun the following yarn, in which he must have believed as much as he did in Hercules or Apollo. The ancestry of Proskura went back to Volodimer the Great. One of his forebears served Anne, the daughter—so Mohyla seems to have said—of the Byzantine emperor who became the wife of Volodimer. This forebear was given the *proskura* (or *prosphora*, the blessed bread eaten after communion) to be carried from church to palace, and ate it on the way. Hence the family nickname Proskura. The nickname was attested by Rus' chroniclers,

10. *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoj Rossii*, pt. 1, vol. 7 (Kiev, 1887), pp. 113–14.

11. Cf. Titov, *Materijaly*, no. 39, p. 269.

whom, of course, Mohyla failed to specify. Under Svjatoslav, prince of Kiev in 1059 (*sic*), the Proskuras received their coat-of-arms—a cross and arrow—in reward for the exploits of one family member in a battle against the infidel Cumans (*hustym trupom pohanskym šyrokoje okryl pole*—most of this phrase, at least, sounded Ukrainian). We must skip four centuries for the next family exploit, assigned to the reign of King Aleksander of Poland (ca. 1500). From then on, it was clear sailing until the time of the recipient of Mohyla's dedication.

To church historians, Mohyla is best known as the author, or principal co-author, of the *Orthodox Confession of Faith*, a treatise in three parts (corresponding to the three theological virtues) that contains about 260 questions and answers. It was discussed and partly emended at a synod in Jassy (Iași) in Moldavia in 1642, and a year later its Greek version was approved by all four Greek Orthodox patriarchs. The *Confession* was first published in simple Greek (*pezē tē phrazei*) in Amsterdam in 1666. It had been elaborated in Kiev in 1640, however, and its original language and one of its sources were, in all likelihood, Latin, although the possible existence of Slavic (most likely, Polish) drafts of the *Confession* should not be ruled out.

When it comes to vernaculars other than Ruthenian, Mohyla's mastery of Polish, both of the scholarly and of the oratorical variety, is safely attested by his own published writings. Furthermore, there is evidence that Mohyla knew some modern Greek and handled it in print and, naturally enough, that he was proficient in spoken Moldavian, although there is no trace of his ever having used Moldavian in writing. Such a find is unlikely, owing both to the cultural situation at the time—practically speaking, the earliest books in Romanian, printed by Ukrainian printers dispatched by Mohyla to Wallachia and Moldavia, date only from the 1640s—and to family tradition. The frescoes in the church at Sucevița founded and richly endowed by the Movilă family are all in Slavonic.

Which languages did Mohyla use for private purposes? My guess is Polish and Ruthenian, rather than Slavonic or Latin. The notes he jotted down about the commissions he made to various goldsmiths in 1629 are in Polish (although one such note and two later entries in books, one of them made in 1637, are in Ruthenian).¹² Moreover, Mohyla chose to write or dictate a deeply personal text, his will, in Polish, rather than in Ruthenian or Latin. In that document he richly endowed his beloved *collegium* and gave it his library of books in several languages, collected over his lifetime (that library burned in the 1650s). With these good deeds, he stated in the will, he imposed on future generations an obligation to continue instruction in Kiev schools as it

12. *Arxiv Jugo-Zapadnoi Rossii*, pt. 1, vol. 7, pp. 184–85.

had been carried on during his lifetime under the privileges granted by his Royal Majesty, the Polish king.

IV

At Easter in 1632, twenty-three pupils (*spudeov*) of the *collegium*, headed by their professor of rhetoric and, presumably, the school's prefect, Sofronij Počas'kyj, submitted to Mohyla a pamphlet of thanks in verse called *Eucharistērion*.¹³ The pamphlet, which included a preface in prose signed by the professor (who used two Greek quotations), had two parts. Both give us some idea of the horizons of the young men studying at the newly founded *collegium* and of the cultural values they encountered there.

The first part of the pamphlet was entitled *Helikon*: Mohyla's pupils erected that mountain of the Muses in a poetic act of gratitude to him. They also called their poem the First Garden of Knowledge. Eight "roots" appeared in it, each described in a verse signed by its student author or, at least, reciter. The "roots" were Grammar, Rhetoric, Dialectic, Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, Astronomy, and Theology, that is, the medieval *trivium* and *quadrivium* in the usual sequence, plus theology. (The appearance of theology expressed the hopes and early aspirations of the school's authorities rather than subsequent reality, for, as we know, the *collegium's* royal charter of 1635 withheld the right to teach that subject.) *Helikon* (or *New Helikon*), in case we have not guessed, referred to the school—or one of the schools—presided over by Mohyla (it was also a pun on his name, Movilă, i.e., "mountain" in Moldavian).

The second part of the pamphlet, also written in verse, was called *Parnass*—again the home of the Muses and of Apollo—or the Second Garden of Knowledge. It, too, was erected by the school's pupils in honor of Mohyla. The second garden had ten offshoots of knowledge, that is, the nine Muses plus Apollo. The existence of two mountains calls for an explanation, and the one that comes readily to mind is that they represented the efforts of the pupils of the Kiev confraternity and the Caves Monastery schools, respectively.

The language of both poems is heavily Polonized Ukrainian. Their two

13. For the text of the *Eucharistērion*, cf., e.g., the facsimile in *The Kiev Mohyla Academy*, a special issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8, no. 1/2 (June 1984): 255–93; and V. I. Krekoten' and M. M. Sulyma, ed., *Ukrajins'ka poezija: Seredyna XVII st.* (Kiev, 1992), pp. 174–88. For a partial, versified translation into modern Ukrainian, cf. *Apollonova ljutnja: Kyjivs'ki poetyky XVII-XVIII st.* (Kiev, 1982), pp. 35–45. For the full text in Ukrainian translation, cf. V. V. Jaremenko, ed., *Ukrajins'ka poezija XVII stolittja (perša polovyna)* (Kiev, 1988), pp. 222–50.

direct messages are the glorification of Christ, the Victor who rose at Eastertime, and the praise of Mohyla. Their two ideological messages seem to reflect the organizational compromise of 1631/32: first, that classics are good, but too classicizing an education is not a good thing; and, second, that the Uniates are certainly abominable.

The poems themselves say this in part: Grammar looks forward to the time when the Rus', descendants of the famous Roxolians (a Sarmatian tribe whose mention provided antique ancestry for the Ruthenians and credentials of erudition for the poem's author), will equal the wise pagans in learning. Dialectic (likened, after a saying of the Stagirite, that is, Aristotle, to a sharp thorn) wishes that the thorn of wisdom would prick the sight of "the sad Uniate basilisks [who are] cruel asps." (Thus Aristotle was placed alongside King David, since the "basilisks" and the "asps" alluded to Psalm 90 [91]:13.) Music quotes the pagans Diogenes and Orpheus as well as the Byzantine John of Damascus. Geometry refers in the same breath to Xenophanes of Colophon and to Christ, "the highest Geometer," who rose from under the earth ("the earth" being *gē* or *gaia* in Greek; bear in mind that the various poems were both honoring Mohyla and celebrating Easter of 1632). In the final poem, on theology, Mohyla is indirectly likened to Hercules. As the "assiduous Spaniard" had set up a marble pillar on the shores of the Western ocean to mark the outer limits of Hercules' labors, so the archimandrite erected a column on the banks of the Dnieper in the "Septentrional" zone (*pry berehax Dniprovyyx pod sedmi triony*) to mark the start of the ocean of theology. On that spot Mohyla would put an end to the Ruthenians' search and to their pilgrimages to faraway lands to study that subject; may the good Lord grant that from now on they listen "to theologians of their own." The verses addressed to Apollo toward the final part of the poem *Parnass* invite the pagan god to visit the Ruthenian lands (*krajev rossijs'kyx*), which hunger for learning. However, at the very end of *Parnass*, both Apollo and his sisters, the Muses, are chased away, and the Virgin Mary is asked to take up her abode among the students of the *collegium*.

Two emblematic woodcuts adorn the tract.¹⁴ One depicts Mohyla himself standing on Mt. Helicon, holding the pastoral staff and the branch of wisdom; he is spurning the sceptre and the crown, an allusion to his having given up a claim to the throne of Moldavia. The other woodcut depicts Mucius Scaevola, the hero of a Latin legend set at the end of the sixth century B.C., standing on Parnassus and putting his right hand into the fire. The scene is included because the Mohyla family claimed descent from this Roman hero—a speculation that can be paralleled in the history of humanism and of the

14. Cf. Titov, *Materijaly*, pp. 293–99.

Balkans.

This second woodcut sums up the composite character of Mohyla's world. Its hero, a Roman, stands on a Greek mountain. With one exception, the explanatory legends are in Cyrillic script, but they contain Polonisms, such as the word *zvytjazcy* for "victor." The single exception is something written in Greek letters on the left arm of the heroic Mucius Scaevola. The meaning of these letters seems to have been overlooked by previous scholarship, yet they deserve scrutiny, for they indicate the degree of familiarity with Greek in Mohyla's milieu. The letters read *skaia cheir* 'left hand,' and thus offer an etymologically correct pun on the name of Scaevola, because *scaevus* and *skaios* mean the same thing, namely, "left(-handed)," in Latin and Greek. Scaevola, we recall, got the nickname "left-handed" after putting his right hand into a burning fire and thus permanently crippling it. He did it to show his steadfastness to the Etruscans (hence the inscription *ohn' Hetruskov* in the woodcut).

We can be virtually certain that Sofronij Počas'kyj, author of the *Eucharistērion*'s preface and perhaps of all its poems as well, was the same person as Stefan Počas'kyj, the student of the confraternity school who recited the first poem of the *Virši*, a tract published in 1622 by Kasijan Sakovyč to commemorate the funeral of Hetman Sahajdačnyj. A decade later, Počas'kyj must have remembered his role in that literary enterprise. In short, there is, *prima facie*, a presumption that the immediate model for the *Eucharistērion* was Sakovyč's *Virši*. (In the wider scheme of things, of course, models for the *Eucharistērion* are to be looked for in contemporary textbooks of poetics and in Polish Renaissance and baroque poetry.) The choice of Easter for reciting the *Eucharistērion* may have been influenced by what the printers of the Kievan Caves Monastery had done in 1630: their *Imnologia*, a collection of ten signed poems, was an Easter offering to Mohyla, in which each author blended praise of Christ, the risen victor, with praise of the archimandrite.

We know almost nothing about the youthful authors (or reciters) of the *Eucharistērion*'s gratulatory poems, with two exceptions. Such individuals as Teodor Suslo or Martyn Suryń are but colorful names to us. The exceptions are Vasylij Suščans'kyj-Proskura—who, as we have surmised, was the son or relative of the addressee of one of Mohyla's prefaces—and Heorhij Nehrebeckij, probably a relative of Father Constantine Niehrębecki, *namiestnik* of St. Sophia of Kiev, and an executor of Mohyla's will.

On the other hand, we know a great deal about some officers or alumni of the *collegium* who were active or graduated during Mohyla's lifetime, for they were among the important intellectuals of the century. They included Jepifanij Slavynec'kyj, the Hellenist recruited to Moscow by Tsar Aleksej Mixajlovič; and Arsenij Korec'kyj-Satanovs'kyj, an assistant to Slavynec'kyj who also went to Moscow. Others, writing in both Ukrainian and Polish, were authors of

sermons and writers prominent in other fields as well: Joannikij Galjatovs'kyj, Lazar Baranovyč, and Antonij Radyvylovs'kyj. Thus, from its very beginnings, Mohyla's *collegium* was both a producer of local intellectual leaders and a purveyor of talent abroad, above all to Moscow. It was to perform this double role for more than a century.

V

Mohyla was a loyal subject of the Polish crown. He composed a liturgical poem in Church Slavonic to celebrate the enthronement of "our great Tsar Władysław [IV]." Whenever he spoke of "our fatherland" (*otczyzna naša*), he meant the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This should not astonish us: the Ukrainian hetman Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj used the term *ojczyzna* in the same sense as late as 1656, at least for the benefit of the Polish crown hetmans and the Polish king. In Mohyla's own mind, the legitimacy of his place on the metropolitan throne of Kiev rested on three foundations: the inspiration of the Holy Ghost that moved the heart of His Majesty, King Władysław IV; the blessing of the holy apostolic capital of Constantinople; and the will of the whole of the Ruthenian nation (*narodu rossijs'koho*).¹⁵ What he and his successor on the Kiev throne, Syl'vestr Kosov, aspired to, but did not obtain, was equality for this Ruthenian nation within the framework of the Commonwealth. For all his Orthodoxy, and in spite of the fact that in 1640 he lavished fulsome praise on Tsar Mixail Fedorovič (from whom he requested material assistance for Kiev's shrines and permission—never granted—to found a monastery in Moscow where Kievan monks could teach Greek and Slavonic to sons of boyars and to simple folk),¹⁶ Mohyla remained politically anti-Muscovite. He praised his noble Ruthenian addressees or their ancestors for taking part in the campaigns against Moscow in the service of the Polish king; he extolled the family of one of them for having waged war on Moscow under King Stefan Batory (Báthory); he commended another addressee for participating in the expedition to Moscow led by the young Władysław IV.¹⁷ When Andrij Borec'kyj, brother of Metropolitan Iov Borec'kyj, in conversation with Mohyla presumably alluded to a possible union between Muscovy and Rus', Mohyla is said to have replied that this alone was enough to have Andrij impaled. The archimandrite's loyalist attitude was a far cry from that of the Borec'kyj brothers; of the Belarusian Afanasij Filippovič (we met him in Essay 10), a man lower on the social scale, who traveled to Moscow and

15. Cf. Titov, *Materijaly*, no. 49, p. 359.

16. Cf. *Pamjatniki izdannye Kievskoj komissieju*, pp. 423–27; *Akty odnosjaščiesja k istorii Južnoj i Zapadnoj Rossii*, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1861), nos. 18 and 33, pp. 27–29, 39.

17. Cf. Titov, *Materijaly*, no. 46, p. 332 and no. 47, p. 339.

embarrassed Mohyla by his Orthodox intransigence; or, finally, of those Orthodox whom Kasijan Sakovyč accused of betraying the Polish Crown's secrets to Moscow before 1646. As we saw, Mohyla's points of reference were Kiev, Warsaw, Jassy, and Constantinople, but hardly Moscow. To fault him for this, to impute that it was not so, or to call his religious policy a "Latin pseudo-morphosis of Orthodoxy" is to disregard our evidence, to imply that the yardstick for measuring what is Orthodox is kept in Russia, and to indulge in anachronism. When it comes to Mohyla's theology, it is advisable to keep the verdict of Mohyla's Orthodox contemporaries in mind. In 1642/43, Greek Orthodox patriarchs and hierarchs found his Orthodoxy in order: they scrutinized his *Orthodox Confession of Faith* and approved it. In its approved form, the document was highly valued. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was accepted as the official profession of faith by all the leaders of the Orthodox churches, including Adrian, the last patriarch of Moscow before Peter I's reforms. Arsenij, enemy of Peter's reforms and metropolitan of Rostov in the 1750s, considered Mohyla's catechism "more essential for the priest than philosophy."

What Mohyla's attitude toward Hetman Xmel'nyc'kyj would have been we cannot say, for his death on 1 January 1647, and burial in the Dormition church of the Caves monastery (where, as early as 1637, he had wished to be buried), preceded Xmel'nyc'kyj's uprising (called a "civil war" in contemporary Polish sources) by more than a year. To form an educated guess on Mohyla's putative attitude, it is helpful to remember that in a hagiographical text dated 1629 he had a local saint frustrate the Zaporozhian Cossacks' plan to plunder the Moldavian city of Suceava, and that at one time or another, his female first cousins were married to Crown Hetman Stanisław Rewera Potocki, to the Polish palatine of Braclav Stefan Potocki, and to the father of the fiercely anti-Cossack prince Jarema Vyšnevec'kyj.

At first, the uprising did not badly disrupt the teaching of the *collegium*—some important students graduated in 1649 or 1650, and only later did the fighting cause serious damage to its buildings—nor did it stem the wave of Latin and Polish influence. To use Mohyla's own words, the whole Ruthenian nation—or, at least, its Ukrainian branch—looked with favor on the *collegium*. In 1651 and 1656, Hetman Xmel'nyc'kyj endowed the monastery of the Kiev confraternity and "the schools attached to it" with lands expropriated from the Dominican fathers in and near Kiev;¹⁸ thus the *collegium* profited from the Cossacks' redistribution of spoils. The Treaty of Bila Cerkva of 1651 expressly mentions the rights of the Kiev *collegium*. Yet the most important

18. Cf. I. Kryp'jakevyč and I. Butyč, *Dokumenty Bohdana Xmel'nyc'koho* (Kiev, 1961), no. 131, pp. 209–10.

assistance the Cossack uprising and its aftermath of 1654 gave the Mohyla *collegium* was indirect—namely, the expulsion of the Jesuits from Ukraine (they had been brought to Kiev in 1620). They never returned to Kiev, so serious competition to the *collegium* was eliminated—a competition that might have been a threat if the Jesuits had stayed. The Cossack decision potentially most advantageous to the *collegium* came not through Xmel'nyč'kyj, but through Hetman Ivan Vyhovs'kyj and the Treaty of Hadjač of 1658. That treaty raised the *collegium* to the rank of an academy and endowed it with the same prerogatives and liberties as “the Academy of the University of Cracow.” It even provided that a second academy was to be erected in Ukraine. Although the relevant provision remained as unenforced as the other provisions of the Hadjač treaty, it did give teachers at the *collegium* a new impetus in their efforts to enhance the stature of their school. In 1670, Hetman Petro Dorošenko instructed his negotiators with the Polish side in Ostrih to press for the establishment of an academy in Ukraine. It would be the Russian tsar, Peter I, however, who would finally satisfy the Kievan teachers' wishes (1694 and 1701).

VI

For all its undeniable achievements, Mohyla's *collegium* did not produce original thought. This was not only because original thought is rare in human affairs, but also because the *collegium's* goal was fully to absorb existing—in this case, Western—cultural standards. Those who are catching up with established value systems strive for parity, not for originality. The persons involved generally do not regard this as a drawback; those few who do so gamble on original contributions coming after parity is achieved.

To be sure, a short-cut to original contributions does exist. It runs through changing the rules of the game: forgetting about catching up and striking out on one's own instead (or in the wake of others who have already left catching-up problems behind). In the history of learning and education, the challenge issued by the fledgling Collège de France to the Sorbonne a century before Mohyla is a case in point. Such short-cuts are taken only rarely in the course of civilization, however, and it would be unfair to Mohyla and to his successors to demand from them an act that was beyond their reach. The original contribution that we might, with some justification, expect from them was of a different kind: favoring the growth of a peculiarly Ukrainian consciousness. In that respect, too, the early *collegium* was the successful continuator of previous incipient trends rather than an initiator of new ones. In later years, an impact on national consciousness was neither explicitly sought nor intended.

One contribution was made in the early period, however: intellectuals in the milieu of Mohyla (as well as in that of his immediate predecessors [see Essay

9]) rediscovered Kiev's early past. The roots of the Kievan present were traced back to that past, and historical continuity was established between early Kievan Rus', on the one hand, and early seventeenth-century Ukraine, on the other. Following in the footsteps of Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj and the *Virši* composed for Sahajdačnyj's funeral in 1622, Mohyla adopted the conception of the Kievan *Primary Chronicle* and traced the nation back to Japheth.¹⁹ That nation was called "the nation of Volodimer" by one student of his school.²⁰ Inscriptions in the Church of the Savior in Berestovo, restored by Mohyla in 1643/44, connect the name of Mohyla as metropolitan of all Rus' (*v'seĭ Rossii*) with that of the "autocrat" ruler of all Rus' (*vseĭ Rossii*), Saint Volodimer (*Vladimir*, who was thereby promoted to imperial rank). We already know that in his genealogical flatteries, Mohyla traced the ancestry of his addressees back to Volodimer's times and invoked Rus' chroniclers in support of his statements. Finally, in *Euphōnia*, the laudatory poem that the students of his school and the printers of Kiev composed on the occasion of Mohyla's consecration in 1633, the "Ruins" of the Cathedral of St. Sophia addressed the new metropolitan in the hope that he would restore the church (which he later did); St. Sophia commended (*polecaju*) its walls, which it had received from Jaroslav the Wise, to the newly installed metropolitan.

As much as establishing historical continuities may appeal to us, this rediscovery of the Kievan past had limited impact. To realize this, we have but to recall that when financial need arose, Mohyla pointed out to the autocratic Muscovite tsar that Volodimer and Jaroslav the Wise, both "autocrat" rulers, were the tsar's forebears; we may also juxtapose the Kiev intellectuals' search for their roots in Rus' with the impressive claims to antiquity and suzerainty that the less sophisticated compilers of the *Stepennaja kniga* or *The Book of Degrees* (in the genealogical sense) had elaborated in Moscow three-quarters of a century earlier. To be sure, there are similarities in the two searches. When Mohyla spoke of "seventeen generations" that had elapsed "since their graces, the Stetkevičes, were born to senatorial dignity,"²¹ the device paralleled the conception of the *Stepennaja kniga*. Kievan intellectuals did little with the resources close to home, however, compared to what the Muscovite bookmen had done with the Kievan tradition; and even such sophisticates as Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj and Afanasij Kal'nofojs'kyj used the Muscovite *Skazanie o knjazjax Vladimirs'kix* to improve upon the

19. Cf. Titov, *Materijaly*, no. 39, p. 268.

20. See H. Rothe, *Die älteste ostslavische Kunstdichtung 1575–1647*, pt. 2 (Giessen, 1977), p. 328.

21. Cf. Titov, *Materijaly*, p. 338.

genealogies of their books' patrons, Princes Stefan and Ilja Četvertyns'kyj.

Before we find these intellectuals sadly wanting, we should consider the differences in the respective historical settings of Kiev and Moscow: the genealogies produced by the Kievan intellectuals addressed the mere remnants of the Ruthenian upper class, while those produced by the bookmen of Moscow supported the claims of a powerful and vigorous dynasty. This dynasty obtained final suzerainty over the city of Kiev in 1686, but its garrisons were present there as early as 1654. From the 1670s, Kiev professors such as Innokentij Gizel' entered the ranks of the dynasty's ideologists, and the practice of establishing *direct* links between the Kiev of St. Volodimer and that of the *collegium* soon had to be abandoned. From then on, the full panoply of speculations about Kiev's glorious past began to be used for the benefit of Kiev's new rulers, and the term *rossijskij*, hitherto applying exclusively to the Rus' of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, began to acquire the meaning of "Russian." As late as July 1705, Prokopovyč called Hetman Mazepa "a great successor" and a mirror image of Volodimer. But on 5 July 1706, during Peter I's visit to Kiev, the same Prokopovyč delivered a welcoming sermon in which he saw to it that both the hills of the Second Jerusalem, Kiev, and its church of St. Sophia sang the glories of the tsar *vsěja Rossii*, descendant and successor not only of Volodimer, but also of Jaroslav, Svjatoslav, Vsevolod and Svjatopolk, and the true embodiment of their virtues.²² To judge by Gizel' and Prokopovyč alone, in the mature period of Mohyla's school, its leading professors used history to promote the notion of all-Russian oneness as much as their predecessors had used it to foster local patriotism.

The main, and most lasting, contribution the *collegium* made to a specifically Ukrainian consciousness was an indirect one, and it began in Mohyla's lifetime. It consisted in raising the general level of Kiev's intellectual life, in imbuing Ruthenian youth with Western cultural notions, and, thus, in providing the elite with cultural self-confidence vis-à-vis the Poles. These Western notions may appear to us, modern readers of the *Eucharistērion*, as not of the highest order. From the local and contemporary point of view, however, a revolutionary change must have occurred for a Ruthenian student to speak of Mt. Helicon rather than Mt. Tabor, and to listen to Horace rather than to the *Oktoix*.

22. For Prokopovyč's flattery of Mazepa, see the Prologue to *Vladimerъ*, in I. P. Eremin, ed., *Feofan Prokopovič: Sočinenija* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1961), p. 152, and in I. V. Krekoten', ed., *Ukrajins'ka literatura XVIII st.* (Kiev, 1983), p. 258. The sermon of 5 July 1706, entitled "Slovo privěstvitel'noe na prišestvie vъ Kievъ Ego Carskago Presvētlogo Veličestva....," is in *Feofana Prokopoviča...Slova i řeči poučitel'nyja, poxval'nyja i pozdravitel'nyja....*, vol. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1760), cf. esp. pp. 2-5; 10-11.

By combining its Western tinge and its Latino-Polish message with Orthodoxy, Mohyla's *collegium* performed a double task: it provided an alternative to the outright Polonization of the Ukrainian elite, and it delayed its Russification until well after 1686. It thus helped strengthen, or at least preserve, that elite's feelings of "otherness" from both Poles and Muscovites (and, subsequently, Russians), and created the basis for later, affirmative feelings of Ukrainian identity.

Today, Mohyla and his *collegium* continue to serve as points of reference for scholars, both in Europe and in North America, who trace the growth of civilization and national traditions among the East Slavs in early modern times. Thus, when a student of the *collegium* wrote, in 1633,

Gdyż Europá, Azja i kraj Ameryká,
Z Płomienistą Lybią Mohiłow wykrzyka,²³

his baroque hyperbole had the makings of a true prophecy.

23. *Mnemosyne*, in Rothe, *Die älteste...Kunstdichtung* (as in n. 20 above), poem 13, ll. 29–30, p. 340: "While Europe, Asia, and the land of America together with the flamboyant Libya [i.e., Africa] proclaim [the glory of] the Mohylas,..."

Bibliographic Note

- Cracraft, J. "Prokopovyč's Kiev Period Reconsidered." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2 (1978): 138–57.
- _____. "Theology at the Kiev Academy during its Golden Age." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8 (1984): 71–80.
- Florovsky, G. *The Collected Works of Georges Florovsky*. Vol. 4, *Aspects of Church History*. Belmont, Mass., 1972.
- _____. *Ways of Russian Theology*, esp. pp. 64–85. Belmont, Mass., 1979.
- Golubev, S. T. *Kievskij mitropolit Petr Mogila i ego spodvižniki: Opyt cerkovno-istoričeskogo issledovanija*. 2 vols. Kiev, 1883–98.
- Graham, H. F. "Mogila, Petr Simeonovič (1596–1647)." *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History* 23 (1981), pp. 9–12.
- _____. "Peter Mogila—Metropolitan of Kiev." *Russian Review* 19 (1955): 345–56.
- Horak, S. "The Kiev Academy: A Bridge to Europe in the Seventeenth Century." *East European Quarterly*, no. 2 (1968): 117–37.
- Hruševs'kyj, M. *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, vol. 6 (= Kievan Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Studies, vol. 1), esp. pp. 556–668 (ample source materials). Kiev, 1995.
- The Kiev Mohyla Academy*, a special issue of *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8, no. 1/2 (June 1984).
- Kowalska, H. s.v. "Mohiła (Moghilă, Movilă) Piotr." *Polski słownik biograficzny* 21, no. 3 (1976), pp. 568–72.
- Krajcar, J. "The Ruthenian Patriarchate—Some Remarks on the Project for its Establishment in the 17th Century." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 30, no. 1–2 (1960): 65–84.
- Łużny, R. *Pisarze kręgu Akademii Kijowsko-Mohylańskiej a literatura polska...* (= Zeszyty naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 142, Prace historyczno-literackie, 11). Cracow, 1966.
- Maxnovec', L. *Ukrajins'ki pys'mennyky*, vol. 1, pp. 415–27. Kiev, 1960.
- Popivchak, P. *Peter Mogila, Metropolitan of Kiev (1633–1647): Translation and Evaluation of His "Orthodox Confession of Faith"*. Washington, D.C., 1975.
- Sydorenko, A. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*, University of Ottawa Ukrainian Studies, 1. Ottawa, 1977. (Bibliography.)
- Thomson, F. J. "Peter Mogila's Ecclesiastical Reforms and the Ukrainian Contribution to Russian Culture...." *Slavica Gandensia* 20 (1993): 67–119.

Xyžnjak, Z. *Kyjevo-Mohyljans'ka akademija*. 2d ed. Kiev, 1981.

Žukovs'kyj, A. *Petro Mohyla j pytannja jednoty cerkov* (= Ukrainian Free University Series: Monographs, 17). Paris, 1969.

Cf. also Bibliographic Notes to Essays 9 and 10.

UKRAINE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST

Essays on Cultural History to
the Early Eighteenth Century

Ihor Ševčenko



Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press
Edmonton 1996 Toronto

Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press

University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta
CANADA T6G 2E8

University of Toronto
Toronto, Ontario
CANADA M5S 1A1

Copyright © 1996 Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
ISBN 1-895571-14-6 (cl); 1-895571-15-4 (pb)

The preparation of the maps for this volume was funded by a generous grant from the Ukrainian Studies Fund, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA.

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Ševčenko, Ihor

Ukraine between East and West : essays on cultural history to the early eighteenth century

(The Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research monograph series ; 1)

Based in part on lectures for the course

"History 154a" at Harvard University, 1970-1974.

ISBN 1-895571-14-6 (cl); 1-895571-15-4 (pb)

1. Ukraine - Civilization - Byzantine influences.
2. Ukraine - Civilization - European influences.
3. Ukraine - History. I. Title. II. Series.

DK508.4.S48 1996 947.71 C96-930406-4

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

Printed in Canada

Contents

Foreword by Frank E. Sysyn

xi

Preface by Ihor Ševčenko

xiii

Note on

Nomenclature and Transliteration

xviii

ESSAY 1

Ukraine between East and West

1

ESSAY 2

Byzantium and the Slavs

12

ESSAY 3

Religious Missions Seen from Byzantium:
The Imperial Pattern and its Local Variants

27

ESSAY 4

The Christianization of Kievan Rus'

46

ESSAY 5

Rival and Epigone of Kiev:
The Vladimir-Suzdal' Principality

56

ESSAY 6

The Policy of the Byzantine Patriarchate
in Eastern Europe in the Fourteenth Century
69

ESSAY 7

Byzantium and the East Slavs after 1453
92

ESSAY 8

Poland in Ukrainian History
112

ESSAY 9

The Rebirth of the Rus' Faith
131

ESSAY 10

Religious Polemical Literature in the Ukrainian and Belarus'
Lands in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries
149

ESSAY 11

The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla
164

ESSAY 12

The Rise of National Identity to 1700
187

Chronological Tables

197

Index

219