

Antoni Mironowicz

Faculty of History and Sociology
University of Białystok

Orthodox Culture in Poland to the end XVIII century

Throughout the Middle Ages and since the formation of its state structure, Poland has been at the crossroads of cultural influences from East and West. By accepting Christianity from the Czechs in 966, Poland entered the sphere of Latin influence. However, Polish lands lay on the outskirts of this Latin, Christian Europe. It was in the Middle Ages that the ethnic and territorial borders of Poland were established and its cultural identity developed. It is therefore worth nothing that the Byzantine-Ruthenian Orthodox Church was present on Polish territory as early as the reign of Bolesław the Brave (992–1025). When Kievan Ruthenia accepted Christianity, the influence of this state assumed a religious character.

The political and cultural role of the Orthodox Church in Poland increased after the creation of the Halich-Volhynia Principality. During the reign of Prince Roman and later prince Daniel, the territory of this principality extended to the lands between the Wieprz and Bug rivers, including Lubachov, Peremyśl, and even a large part of the Lublin region. In 1238, Daniel conquered Drohychyn, which opened the way for the Romanovich dynasty to expand their territory in the north¹. As the territories grew so too did the Orthodox Church's structure develop. This structure developed formally in the middle of the thirteenth century, after the coronation of Prince Daniel in Drohychyn (1253). However, the attempt made then by the papal legate Opizon to draw the ruler of the Halich-Volhynia Princedom into union with Rome failed. Political conflicts with Roman Catholic powers – Hungary, Poland (with the Prince of Cracow, Leszek the White) and the Teutonic Knights – caused the Orthodox clergy to oppose any

¹ B. Włodarski, *Polska i Ruś 1194–1340*, Warszawa 1966, p. 45 and following. The History of the Duchy of Volynia from the eleventh through to the thirteenth century has been well developed in such works as V. Pashko, *Ocherki po istorii Galitsko-Volynskoi Rusi*, Moscow, 1950; I. Krypiakievych, *Halitsko-Volynske kniazhstvo*, Kiev 1984; H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. VI, part. 1, Warszawa 1985; and A. Swieżawski, *Ziemia bełska. Zarys dziejów politycznych do roku 1462*, Częstochowa 1990.

ties with the Roman Catholic Church.² Nonetheless, the re-conquest of the Lublin region in 1244 as well as other territories by Polish princes caused an increase in the number of Orthodox faithful in Polish-ruled lands. This problem became particularly painful for the Orthodox at the beginning of the fourteenth century, when the Polish lands were united in a single state.³

In the fourteenth century, the Kingdom of Poland lost large areas of ethnically Polish lands in the west, but its eastern border moved to the rivers Dniestr and Prypets. When Casimir the Great (1333–1370) joined Halich Ruthenia to the Polish lands, the religious and ethnic balance of the country changed: Poland lost its religious and national unity. The last member of the Piast dynasty incorporated non-Polish lands together with their Orthodox inhabitants. During his rule, the Latin and Ruthenian-Byzantine traditions met on a large scale in Poland and Lithuania. Both states had long since expanded into Halich Ruthenia and Volhynia. Now, however, Ruthenians became subjects of these medieval states and, in some regions, they formed a majority. The old Belarusian language became the official language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, and Ruthenian culture was gladly accepted by Lithuanian princes and boyars. As a result, Lithuanians became partly Christianised by the Eastern Church. Lithuania, having Ruthenian lands in its borders, was only formally a pagan state⁴.

Byzantine culture spread in the Polish and Ruthenian lands through the Orthodox Church. The Orthodox culture became an object of interest for the last members of the Piast dynasty. Casimir the Great used the services of Ruthenian painters and builders. Ruthenian artists worked on the decoration of the Vislitsa College and the Wawel Chapel founded by the king. They also built the “hetman’s” house in the Main Square. During the rule of Casimir the Great, one of the greatest Orthodox churches of the time was built, the Church of St. George in Lvov.

The fourteenth century brought new canonisations, including those of saints worshiped throughout the Ruthenian church province. For the development of Christianity in Lithuania, the canonisation of three Vilnius martyrs – Antonio, John, and Eustace – was especially important. Before accepting Christianity,

² W. Abraham, *Powstanie organizacji Kościoła łacińskiego na Rusi*, Lwów 1904, pp. 121–143; Makarii (Bulgakov, M. P.), *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, vol. 3, part 1, Moscow 1995, pp. 332–333; W. Abraham, *Powstanie organizacji Kościoła łacińskiego na Rusi*, Lwów 1904, pp. 121–143; E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, vol. II, Moscow 1900, pp. 82–86.

³ T. M. Trajdos, „Metropolici kijowscy Cyprian i Grzegorz Camblak a problemy Cerkwi prawosławnej w państwie polskołitewskim u schyłku XIV i pierwszej ćwierci XV w.”, *Balkanica Posnaniensia. Acta et studia*, vol. II, Poznań 1985, pp. 213–214; J. Fijałek, „Biskupstwa greckie na ziemiach ruskich od połowy XIV wieku na podstawie źródeł greckich,” *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 11 (1897), pp. 27–34.

⁴ A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, Białystok 2003, pp. 55–188.

they bore pagan names: Niazhyla, Kumiets, Kruglets. They were all cousins to Olherd Gedyminovich (1345–1377). Under the influence of the Orthodox Nestor, the young Ruthenian princes accepted Christianity and became its active proselytisers. Similarly to St. Kharytyn, the brothers propagated Christianity among the people of Zhmudz. This activity brought reprisals from the Lithuanian princes and in 1347 the Lithuanian prince Olherd sentenced them to death. Their canonisation took place at the local Orthodox Church sobor in 1364. In 1374, their relics were moved to the St. Sofia church in Constantinople and after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, thanks to the efforts of the metropolitans of Kiev, they were returned to Vilnius. To this day, they are kept in the Holy Spirit monastery church⁵. The canonisation of metropolitan Peter, who died in 1326, was no less important. It was initiated by the metropolitan of Kiev and Moscow Teognost, who asked the Patriarch of Constantinople's permission to conduct it as soon as 1339. The canonisation of an outstanding hierarch was intended to confirm the unity of the Orthodox Church in Ruthenian lands⁶.

*

The importance of the Orthodox Church in the cultural life of Poland grew after the union of Krev. During the rule of the Yahyellons, the Orthodox Church, which had been earlier legally restricted, became an important part of the inner and foreign policy of the state⁷. The Yahyellonian dynasty treated the Orthodox as their own subjects. Contrary to the Andegavens or Valezys, they built their power on the multi-religious structure of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, an approach alien to the western model of a single-denomination Roman Catholic state, with one dominant Latin culture. The Yahyellonians were forced to take such a position by the ethnic structure of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

At the turn of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the influence of Byzantine-Ruthenian religious art was strongest in Poland. This development was mostly connected with the patronage of Ladislau Yahyello⁸, who liked Ruthe-

⁵ G. P. Fiedotov, *Sviatyie drevniei Rusi (X–XVII st.)*, New York 1959, pp. 18–31; Monachia Taisia, ed., *Zhytitiia sviatykh*, vol. I, New York 1983, pp. 211–218; A. A. Mielnikov, *Put' niepiechalen. Istoricheskie sviidietielstva o sviatosti Bieloi Rusi*, Minsk 1992, pp. 144–152; A. Mironowicz, *Święci w Kościele prawosławnym na Białorusi*, in E. Feliksiak and A. Mironowicz, eds., *Wilno i kresy północno-wschodnie*, vol. I: *Historia i ludzkie losy*, Białystok 1996, p. 86, 87.

⁶ E. Golubinsky, *Istoriia kanonizatsyi sviatykh w Russkoi Tserkvi*, p. 67, 68; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, pp. 138–140.

⁷ T. Wasilewski, „Prawosławne imiona Jagiełły i Witolda,” *Analecta Cracoviensia*, 19 (1987), pp. 107–115.

⁸ See F. Sielicki, *Polsko-ruskie stosunki kulturalne do końca XV wieku*, Wrocław 1997; A. Mironowicz, „Prawosławni w wielowyznaniowej i wielokulturowej Rzeczypospolitej,” in St. Wilka, ed., *Chrześcijaństwo w dialogu kultur na ziemiach Rzeczypospolitej. Materiały Międzynarodowego Kongresu*, Lublin 2003, pp. 202–220; *ibid.*, „Kultura prawosławna w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej” in A. Kaźmierczyk *et al*, eds., *Rzeczpospolita wielu wyznań*, Cracow 2004, p. 409–436.

nian art more than Casimir the Great. The king was brought up in Lithuania, surrounded with Orthodox Church art. His mother, Yulianna, duchess of Tversk raised him in the Byzantine-Ruthenian cultural tradition, had a strong influence on his attachment to Orthodox Church art. Fascinated by Orthodox Church art, Yahyello invited Ruthenian painters to decorate his churches, residences, and castle interior. They used Byzantine-style polychrome in the cathedral in Gniezno and Sandomier, the Vislitsa College, the Benedictine Holy Cross Church on Łysa Góra, the Holy Trinity Chapel in Lublin and the royal bedrooms in the Wawel Castle⁹. Yahyello's fourth wife, Sophia Holshanska, did much for the development of Ruthenian culture in Poland. Although she accepted Roman Catholicism when she married Yahyello in 1422, her love for Ruthenian art was widely known. The Holy Trinity Chapel in the Cracow Cathedral became her tomb. Although not many churches decorated by Ruthenian artists have survived until modern times, we can speak of a period of expansion of Ruthenian culture in Latin churches. Never before had eastern art been incorporated to such an extent in the world of western Gothic art. The Byzantine-Ruthenian polychrome work preserved in Lublin, Vislitsa, Sandomierz and the holy Cross chapel by the Cracow cathedral confirms the strong influence that Orthodox art had on fifteenth-century church architecture in Poland. By the end of the fourteenth century, every third inhabitant of Poland was Ruthenian. This fact was reflected in Polish music, art, and writing¹⁰.

Of the examples noted above, the best preserved is the polychrome in the Holy Trinity church in Lublin. On ribbed Gothic ceilings, on columns, and in the presbytery, frescoes were appeared in the Byzantine-Ruthenian style, in distinct contrast with the architectural style of the structure itself. The Lublin polychrome was made in 1418 by a group of painters under the direction of Master Andrei. The Holy Trinity Chapel in Lublin castle, with its Byzantine frescoes, therefore becomes a synthesis of Byzantine-Ruthenian and Latin cultures¹¹.

Ruthenian art traditions prevailed not only around the Yahyellonian court. In the Yahyellonian period, Orthodoxy became a national and popular faith,

⁹ A. Różycka-Bryzek, „Zarys historyczny badań nad bizantyńsko-ruskimi malowidłami w Polsce”, *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, vol. XXVII, Warsaw 1965; „Bizantyjsko-ruskie malowidła ścienne w Kaplicy Świętokrzyskiej na Wawelu.” *Studia do dziejów Wawelu*, vol. III, Cracow 1967; E. Chojecka, „Sztuka średniowiecznej Rusi Kijowskiej i jej związki z Polską w XI–XV w.,” in M. Karasia and A. Podraży, eds., *Ukraina. Teraźniejszość i przeszłość [Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, CCXLVII, Prace Historyczne, no. 32]*, Cracow 1970, p. 413; J. Kłoczowski, *Młodsza Europa*, p. 333, 334; A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w państwie Piastów i Jagiellonów*, pp. 187.

¹⁰ F. Sielicki, *Polsko-ruskie stosunki kulturalne do końca XV wieku*, Wrocław 1997, p. 106.

¹¹ A. Różycka-Bryzek, „Sztuka w Polsce piastowskiej a Bizancjum i Ruś,” in St. Stępnia, ed., *Polska – Ukraina. 1000 lat sąsiedztwa*, vol. II, Peremyśl 1994, pp. 295–306; „Bizantyjsko-ruskie malowidła w Polsce wczesnojagiellońskiej: problem przystosowań na gruncie kultury łacińskiej,” *ibidem*, pp. 307–326.

through the ubiquity of its various forms of worship. For example, the worship of miraculous icons and holy places notably increased in the religious practices of the faithful. This form of worship influenced the spiritual consciousness of the faithful and permeated literature and art. The worship of miraculous icons of the Virgin Mary, which developed under the influence of Orthodoxy, spread in Poland on a scale unknown in other Roman Catholic countries. The best expression of this phenomenon is the worship of the Mother of God icon from Częstochowa, which was offered to the Pauline monastery in Jasna Góra in 1382 by Ladislau Opolchyk. The Mother of God icon, which was brought from Belz to the Częstochowa monastery, gave rise to miraculous icon worship, which became a constant part of Polish and Ruthenian religious tradition¹². At the time, other miraculous icons were equally commonly worshiped: from Kiev Caves Monastery, Smolensk, Vlodymyr, Zaslav, Novodvor, Polotsk, Korsun, Kupiatych¹³. From the end of the 14th century, we can see a symbiosis of Belarusian and Polish culture, especially in Orthodox Church architecture and writing. Rich monastery libraries preserved numerous chronicles and Holy Scriptures from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The best known are the Ewangeliarz Orshansky, Ewangeliarz Mstiski, and Ewangeliarz Lavryshevsky¹⁴.

¹² T. Mroczko, B. Dab, „Gotyckie Hodegetrie polskie,” *Średniowiecze. Studia o kulturze*, vol. III, Wrocław 1966, pp. 20–32; A. Rogov, „Chenstokhovskaia ikona Bogomateri kak pamiatnik vizantijsko-russko-polskikh sviaziei,” *Drevnerusskoie iskusstvo. Khudozhestvennaia kultura domongolskoi Rusi*, Moscow 1972, pp. 316–321; *ibid.*, „Ikona M. B. Częstochowskiej jako świadectwo związków bizantyjsko-rusko-polskich,” *Znak*, no. 262, (1976), pp. 509–516; F. Sielicki, „Polsko-ruskie stosunki kulturalne...”, pp. 101, 102.

¹³ A. Różycka-Bryzek, „Bizantyjskie malarstwo jako wykładnia prawd wiary. Recepcja na Rusi – drogi przenikania do Polsko,” in A. Kubiś i A. Rusecki, eds., *Chrześcijańskie dziedzictwo bizantyjsko-słowiańskie*, Lublin 1994, pp. 65–66; A. Różycka-Bryzek, *Bizantyjsko-ruskie malowidła w kaplicy zamku lubelskiego*, Warsaw 1983, p. 9, 10; E. Chojecka, „Sztuka średniowiecznej Rusi Kijowskiej i jej związki z Polską w XI–XV w.,” in M. Karasia i A. Podraży, eds., *Ukraina. Teraźniejszość i przeszłość [Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, CCXLVII, Prace Historyczne, no. 32]*, Cracow 1970, p. 422; A. I. Rogov, „Kulturnye sviazi Rusi i Polshy w XIV – nachale XV v.,” *Vestnik Moskovskogo Uniuersiteta*, siera IX: *Istoria*, no. 4 (1972), pp. 63–71; A. Mironowicz, „Kult ikon Matki Bożej na Białorusi,” *Białostocki Przegląd Kresowy*, 5 (1996). pp. 137–141; *ibid.*, „Jozafat Dubieniecki – Historia cudownego obrazu żyrowickiego,” *Rocznik Teologiczny*, 33, no. 1, (1991), pp. 195–215; G. Luzhnijsky, „Slovník Chudotvornikh Bohorodichnykh ikon Ukrainy,” *In trepido Pastori*, (Rim 1984), pp. 153–188; L. A. Kornilova, „Stranitsy bieloruskoi mariologii: Zhyrovichskaia, Bielynichskaia i Ostrobramskaia ikony Bogomateri,” *Sbornik Kaluzhskogo khudozhestviennogo muzieia*, 1 (1993), pp. 30–33; N. Talberg, *Prostranny miesiatseslov russkikh sviatykh i kratkia sviadenia o chudotvornykh ikonakh Bozhyei Materi*, Jordanville 1951; S. Snessorieva, *Zemnaia zhyzn Presvatoi Bogoroditsy i opisaniie sviatykh chudotvornykh ieie ikon*, Iaroslavl 1998; A. Jaskievich, *Spradviechnaia akhoūnitsa Bielarusi*, Minsk 2001.

¹⁴ T. Friedłówna, *Ewangeliarz ławryszewski. Monografia zabytku*, Wrocław 1974; M. Nikalajeū, *Palata knihapisniaia*, Minsk 1993.

*

The Orthodox Church art traditions were continued during the reign of Casimir Yahyellonian, who upheld the dynasty's love for Ruthenian art. The king's artistic aspirations were supported by his wife, Elizabeth Rakushanka (1436–1505)¹⁵. During this period, the greatest cultural venture connected with the Orthodox Church was the opening of Shvajpolt Fiol's Cyrillic printing house in Cracow. Its opening was initiated by the Orthodox nobility, who remained at the Cracow court, to supply the Orthodox people with liturgical books. The actual initiators of this venture are found among the members of the Gashtołd, Softan, and Sapieha families. A Cracow entrepreneur and councillor Jan Turzon, financed Fiol's enterprise, hoping to generate income. It is hard to find in Fiol's and Turzon's actions aims other than the purely commercial. The neatness and opulent decorations of the Cyrillic books indicate, that they were meant for Orthodox nobility and monasteries. These books were found throughout the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Moscow Ruthenia¹⁶.

Neither was the selection of printed books left to chance. Fiol's printing house released four liturgical books in the Church Slavonic language: *Czasosłowiec* (*Chasosloviets*) – a kind of breviary containing prayers and psalms for selected times of day and night (Cracow 1491), *Ośmiohłasnik albo Oktoich* (*Osmiohłasnik albo Oktiokh*) – a selection of hymns by St. John of Damascus in an eight-syllable arrangement (Cracow 1491); *Triod postnaja* – containing prayers and the entire Lent ritual; and *Triod cwiernaja* (*Triod tsvietnaja*) – containing songs, prayers and rituals for the Easter period. The last two publications, *Triod postnaja* and *Triod cwiernaja*, were printed in Cracow before 1490. *Oktoich* was the most frequently used liturgical work in the Orthodox Church for it contained the changing parts of the service for various days of the week and every day in the weekly cycle (prayers and songs for the evening and morning mass and for the liturgy)¹⁷. In 1490–1491, the Cracow printing house was the first to release publications in the Church Slavonic language for the use of the Orthodox Church. The illustrations for Fiol's books were made in the Ruthenian art style. When publishing the liturgical books, Fiol expected neither the amount

¹⁵ W. Molé, „Sztuka bizantyńsko-ruska,” in [editor?] *Historia sztuki polskiej w zarysie*, vol. I, Cracow 1962, p. 161.

¹⁶ K. Heintsch, *Ze studiów nad Sz wajpoldem Fiolem*, Wrocław 1957; H. Szwejowska, *Książka drukowana XV–XVIII w.*, Wrocław 1961, pp. 33–37; J. Nemirovskii, *Nachalo slavianskogo knigopечатania*, Moscow 1969; A. Kawecka-Gryczowa ed., *Drukarze dawnej Polski*, vol. I, part. 1, Wrocław 1983, pp. 25–39.

¹⁷ J. Rusek, „Oktoich Sz wajpolda Fiola a rękopiśmienne Oktoichy w księgozbiórach polskich,” in J. Rusek, W. Witkowski i A. Naumow, eds., *Najstarsze druki cerkiewnoślawiańskie i ich stosunek do tradycji rękopiśmiennej*, Cracow 1993, pp. 37–44; M. Prokopowicz, „Trzy wersje Triodu postnego z 1491 r.,” in *ibidem*, pp. 55–68.

of interest among the Orthodox, nor the significant opposition from the Roman Catholic clergy. In November 1491, the printer was charged with heresy and imprisoned, in spite of Turzon's bail. Finally, Fiol was cleared of the charge of heresy, but the Gniezno chapters [of what?] forbade him to publish and distribute CŹyryllic books.

The position of Primate Zbigniew Olenicki could well have been influenced by the 1487 bull issued by Pope Innocent III and which ordered the Roman Catholic Church authorities to use preventive censorship for all publishing. Shvajpolt Fiol's printing house, which served the Orthodox faithful in Ruthenian areas of the Polish Kingdom and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, was to be used in religious polemics. Since it was not possible to oppose the Ruthenian nobles directly, the lawsuit against the printer was used to close down the printing house itself¹⁸.

*

The sixteenth century brought significant changes in the religious life of the Ruthenian people. The traditional religiosity of the Orthodox which was not well supported dogmatically met the dynamic Protestant and post-Tridentine Roman-Catholic churches. However, at the time of the last two Yahyellons, all restrictions against the Orthodox people were removed. Another factor influencing the position of the faithful was the secularisation and materialism of the higher clergy. As a result, only part of the clergy (mostly monastic) was prepared well enough to defend dogma and to take part in theological disputes. The position of the clergy was often weakened by the *kitors*, who undermined the prestige of the Orthodox Church, by interfering with its internal affairs. A new phenomenon in religious life was the collective patronage of the church brotherhoods and the involvement of laymen in the reformation of the church. In view of the threat from new religious movements, attempts were made from the 1570s to reach wider masses of Ruthenian society. Many institutions were consequently opened, such as printing houses, hospitals, poorhouses, and schools. Catechisation also developed, through polemics, preachers, and messages. These efforts attempted to influence the Ruthenian elites to keep the common laity in the Orthodox Church. The elite's conversion to other denominations was accompanied by a growing religious consciousness among the Orthodox faithful. As a result, of a great reforming effort, taken up mostly by the brotherhoods and church elites, a visible change in religious life occurred. The religious knowledge of the Ruthenian elites increased. Active work for the benefit of their church became an obligation of the Orthodox elites. This development was expressed in the large number of foundations and bequests from Ruthenian lords to the Church and their involvement in the defence of the Orthodox Church's rights.

¹⁸ H. Szejnkowska, *Książka drukowana...*, p. 48–49.

The development of the movement for reform also included the faithful of the Eastern Church. It spread widely among the Ruthenian nobility. In 1572, only 24 out of the 69 senators of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania were Ruthenian and this figure included 8 Orthodox, 15 Protestant, and one Roman Catholic¹⁹. Nevertheless, the political role of the Ruthenian senators was much greater than their number. Orthodox Lithuanian-Ruthenian dignitaries formed and put into action the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth's eastern policy. Such great families as the Buchatsky, Khodkievichy, Chartorysky, Sanhushky, Sapiehy, Siemashky, Slutsky, Solomeretsy, Tyshkievichy, Massalsky, Olelkovichy, Meleshky, Patsy, Puzyny, Vollovichy, Khreptovichy, Khaletsky, Tryzyny, Hulevichy, Visniovietsky, Zaslavstsy, Zbarastysy remained Orthodox. The Ruthenian magnates played a major role in the development of Orthodox culture and education. Their patronage of Orthodox Church culture was visible in the impressive publishing and literary activity, which showed a significant intellectual element in the Polish-Lithuanian Orthodox Church. They inspired the continuation of Shvajpolt Fiol's work by Francisk Skoryna, a graduate of the Cracow Academy from Polotsk, a doctor of medical sciences from the University in Padua and a humanist. In 1517–1519, Skoryna published the first edition of the Bible in the Old Belarusian language. Apart from many editions of the Bible, Skoryna published the *Little travel book* (*Mała księga podróżna*) addressed mostly to merchants. The patronage of the Lithuanian hetman Gregory Khodkevich allowed for the opening of a Ruthenian printing house in his family residence in Zabludov. In 1569, two printers, Peter Tymofeevich Mstislavets and Ivan Fedorov, published there the *Evangelije Uchitielnoje*, a selection of religious tools [Antoni – I'm not sure what is meant here.] for analysing the Bible. The Zabludov Evangel, the equivalent of the Roman Catholic and Protestant *Postyllas*, was published 12 years after the *Postylla* by Mikołaj Rej and four years before the analogous work by Jacob Vojek²⁰.

A special role in the development of the Orthodox culture was played by Prince Constantine Bazyli Ostrozky (1527–1608), the voievod of Kiev, marshal of Volhynia, and the founder of many schools, churches, and monasteries. This outstanding Orthodox magnate planned to move the residence of the Patriarchate from Constantinople to Ostroh. In 1580, he created in his residence the famous printing house which published the Ostroh Bible, which was the greatest undertaking in Orthodox publishing at the time²¹. Printing houses working for

¹⁹ A. Jobert, *De Luther á Mohil: La Pologne dans la crise de la Chrétienté 1517–1648*, Paris 1979, p. 322.

²⁰ A. Mironowicz, „Powstanie zabludowskiej oficyny wydawniczej na tle sytuacji wyznaniowej w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim,” *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, 19 (1990), p. 245–264; Z. Jaroszewicz-Pierśławcew, *Druki cyrylickie z oficyn Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XVIII wieku*, Olsztyn 2003, pp. 17–46.

²¹ T. Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski, wojewoda kijowski i marszałek ziemi wołyńskiej*, Toruń 1997; A. Mironowicz, *Kultura prawosławna w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, p. 420.

the Orthodox Church were opened in Lvov, Vilnius, and in many other places. In Vilnius, there was the Mamonich brothers' printing house. After the Brotherhood of the Holy Spirit joined the union, their printing house and Bohdan Oginsky's typography in Jew took over. In Lvov, a particularly important printing house was that belonging to the stauropegial brotherhood, which continued working into the 1820s²². Cyrillic printing houses were supposed to help to distribute liturgics texts, which suited the spirit of the Orthodox Church. Printing houses were among the attempts to reform the Orthodox Church and their existence shows the increasing religious consciousness of the Ruthenian people.

The best indicator showing the role of the Orthodox Church in Poland's Ruthenian society is the prevalence of literacy among the faithful of the "Greek Faith". Literacy was quite common among the upper classes and townspeople as early as the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Counting the almost 50,000 liturgical books in circulation²³, we can imagine the spiritual development of the people at the time. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania alone there were about 500 church and monastery libraries holding from a few to a few dozen books. The greatest achievements of legal thought were included in the Lithuanian Statutes written and published in 1529, 1566, and 1588. These collections of traditional laws included many elements of Orthodox Church law, but also signaled the spread of the Renaissance among Ruthenians. These cultural achievements could not have been made without the Orthodox Church. Its influence developed church architecture, painting, chants, and writings.

Monasteries played a special role in this process. In Ruthenian lands, they were the main centres of religious life and the foundation of the Orthodox Church structure. They played a major role in developing culture and education and strengthening the morality of the faithful. In the sixteenth century, the largest centre of monastic life – the Caves Monastery in Kiev²⁴ – spread its spirituality and culture. The role of the monastery in the life of the Orthodox Church was accurately presented by its archimandrite-to-be Syl'vester Kosov, who saw the value of the rich spiritual literature left by the Kiev monks. When he became the archimandrite father, Syl'vester wrote the *Paterikon, albo żywoty świętych Ojców Peczerskich obszernie słowieńskim językiem przez świętego Nestora zakonnika i latopisca ruskiego przedtym napisany, teraz zaś z greckich, łacińskich,*

²² A. Mironowicz, „Drukarnie bractw cerkiewnych” in A. Mironowicz, U. Pawluczuk i P. Chomik, eds., *Prawosławne oficyny wydawnicze w Rzeczypospolitej*, Białystok 2004, pp. 52–68.

²³ J. Kłoczowski, „Cywilizacja bizantyjsko-słowiańska,” in J. Kłoczowski, ed., *Chrześcijaństwo na Rusi Kijowskiej, Białorusi, Ukrainie i Rosji (X–XVII w.)*, Cracow 1997, p. 95.

²⁴ K. Chodynicki, *Kościół prawosławny a Rzeczpospolita Polska. 1370–1632*, Warsaw 1943, p. 138–150; *Kievo-Pecherski Patierik ili skazaniia o zhyznii i podvigakh Sviatykh Ugodnikov Kievo-Pecherskoi Lavry*, Kiev 1991; Ludmiła Nadzyńska, ed., *Patieryk Kijowsko-Peczerski czyli opowieści o świętych ojcach w pieczarach kijowskich położonych*, Wrocław 1993.

słowiańskich i polskich pisarzy objaśniony i krócej podany przez wielebnego w Bogu ojca Sylwestra Kosova, episkopa mścislawskiego, orszańskiego i mohilewskiego (Paterikon, or the lives of the holy Fathers of Pechersk broadly in the Slavic tongue written down earlier by st. Nestor Ruthenian monk and chronicler and now from Greek, Latin, Slavic and Polish writers explained and in shorter form given by the reverend in Father God Syl'vester Kosov, episcopo of Mstsislav, Orshansk and Mohylev). In this important work, published in the printing house of Kiev's Caves Monastery in 1635, the author presented the "ineffability of the holy fathers of Pechersk, their bodies preserved for hundred of years, having laid in the caverns of Kiev, and as evidence of the true miracles, which have happened and continue to happen through their relics". He wrote: "Walking, (...) in the Kiev caverns, among the graves of the holy fathers, wondering over their holy and untainted bodies, not once I cried, seeing that unhappy past ages so far have not revealed to the world the chosen of God, as God himself had revealed"²⁵. This word picture shows Kiev as a bastion of Christianity. Kiev's Caves Monastery, which gathered so many relics of the saints, was for Kosov the spiritual centre of the Church and the monastery's authority reached beyond Polish borders. The cult of the holy fathers of the Caves Monastery was equally common among Orthodox and Roman Catholics. Adding to this tradition were the dozens of chronicles and annals, rich polemical and hagiographical literature we turned this monastery into a cultural centre for the whole Slavic world.

The monastery of Suprasl, in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, had a similar character. In the second half of the sixteenth century, it was dominated by anti-Latin, anti-union, and anti-reforming tendencies. These views were expressed in the paintings, polemical literature, and the monks' activities. The iconographic symbolism of the church of the Annunciation further served this common purpose. The interior of the sobor church shows a direct connection with the Ruthenian and Serbian cultures. Its architecture is similar to the defensive churches of St. Sofia in Polotsk, Synkovitche and Malomozheykov²⁶. In the church's architecture, viewers still see the strong influences of the Byzantine-Ruthenian culture in western areas of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The style

²⁵ *Pateryk Kijowsko-Peczerski...*, p. 53, 54.

²⁶ p. Alexandrowicz, „Nowe źródło ikonograficzne do oblężenia Połocka w 1579 roku,” *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej*, 19, no. 1 (1971), pp. 19–22; I. I. Jodkovsky, „Tserkvi prisposoblennye k oboronie w Litwie i Litovskoi Rusi,” *Drevnosti*, 6, 1915, p. 249–311; W. A. Chanturia, *Istoriia arkhitektury Bielorusii* (Minsk, 1969) pp. 88–90; M. Katsner, *Bieloruskaia arkhitektura*, Minsk 1969, p. 48–52; W. Kochanowski, „Pobazylijański zespół architektoniczny w Supraślu,” *Rocznik Białostocki*, no. 4 (1963), pp. 355–396; M. Morelowski, *Zarys syntetyczny sztuki wileńskiej od gotyku do neoklasycyzmu z przewodnikiem po zabytkach między Niemnem a Dźwiną*, (Wilno, 1939); P. P. Pokryshkin, „Blagovieshchenskaia cerkov' w Supraslskom monastyrze,” in *Sbornik arkhieograficheskikh statii i podniesiennyi grafu A. A. Bobrinskomu*, Sankt-Peterburg 1911, pp. 22–237; A. Szyszko-Bogusz, „Warowne zabytki architektury kościelnej w Polsce i na Litwie,” *Sprawozdanie Komisji do badań sztuki w Polsce*, 9, no. 3–4, (1914).

of these frescoes brings to mind the Serbian monumental painting, especially the interior of the monastery in Manasia from 1418²⁷. They are among the few examples of Byzantine paintings in historic Poland.

Among the 200 manuscripts and printed books kept in the monastery library in 1557 was the *Minieja Chetnaja* from the early eleventh century²⁸. This manuscript is the oldest piece of Cyrillic writing in Poland, brought to Supraśl in 1582 by the Patriarch Gabriel of Serbia and Bulgaria. In the monastery's library, there was a copy of *The Chronicle of Kiev and Novogrod*²⁹. The Supraśl version of the Belarusan-Lithuanian 1519 chronicle invokes the Old Ruthenian tradition. The church library also possessed other Ruthenian annals: *Tsarstvennik s letopistsem* and *Vremennik s letopistsem*. The awareness of a common historical and cultural heritage with other East-Slavic nations and religious unity added to the popularity of the biographies of Ruthenian, Bulgarian, Serbian and Greek saints³⁰.

*

Orthodox Church schools also played a major role in the development of Orthodox culture in Poland³¹. The development of monastic and parish schools appeared only at the end of the fifteenth and in the sixteenth centuries along with the development of education in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. During the Renaissance, schools appeared under the patronage of burghers and church brotherhoods. The development of education was no accident, as it occurred at a time of religious polemics and the intellectual battle for the preservation of the dogma of various churches. The hierarchy of the Orthodox Church wanted schools to play a major role in preserving the identity of the faithful. Orthodox education in the sixteenth century could be divided into three categories: monastic schools, church schools, and brotherhood schools. In Poland, the Ostroh Academy formed a separate category. Monastic schools proved to be the most stable for they only taught a small number of students (no more than ten or twenty) at the elementary level. Church schools were organized to teach two or three students on the matters of church service order. Reading and writing

²⁷ A. Rogov, „Freski iz Suprasla,” *Drevneruskoe isskustvo. Monumentalnaia zhyvopis XI–XVII v.*, Moscow 1980, pp. 345–371.

²⁸ The Supraśl Codex – the oldest piece of Cyrillic writing was reprinted in Bulgaria. *Supraslski ili Retkov sbornik*, Sofia 1982, vol. I–II, Study and introduction J. Zaimowa and M. Kopaldo; A. Mironowicz, *Kodeks supraslski*, „Białostoczczyzna” 1988, no. 1 (9), p. 1–3.

²⁹ *Supraslskaia letopiś*, [in:] *Polnoie sobranie russkikh letopisiei*, vol. XXXV, Moscow 1980, p. 6.

³⁰ A. Mironowicz, *Podlaskie ośrodki i organizacje prawosławne w XVI–XVII wieku*, Białystok 1991, p. 89–94; *ibid*, *Życie monastyczne na Podlasiu*, Białystok 1998, p. 5–32.

³¹ A. Mironowicz, *Szkolnictwo prawosławne w Rzeczypospolitej*, [in:] *Szkolnictwo prawosławne w Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. A. Mironowicza, U. Pawluczuk i P. Chomika, Białystok 2002, p. 18–30.

came to be regarded as basic for the preservation of the faith. The level attained depended on the education and abilities of the teaching clergymen or deacon.

Brotherhood schools served as secondary educational institutions. The first brotherhood school was founded in Vilnius in 1584. The privilege to open a school was granted by Stefan Batory. The school was to teach Ruthenian, Greek, Latin and Polish³². Soon two elementary schools were also created in Vilnius as well as the first Orthodox secondary school for the humanities. These Vilnius schools became examples for other brotherhood schools. In the following years, the Lvov and Vilnius brotherhoods assisted the establishment of new schools in Lviv, Stryj, Hrodek, Peremyśl, Brest, Belsk, Mohyleŭ, Minsk, Pinsk, Jew, Shklovo, Kiev, Lutsk, Khelm, Zamosts, Halich, and Ostroh³³. The quality of education in these schools, especially those in Lvov and Vilnius, was quite high. One example of this achievement is the significant role that their graduates played in the life of the Church (Stefan and Leontsiush Zyzanii, Yov Boretsky, Izajash Kopinsky, Meleti Smotrytsky, Izajash Trofimovich, Sylvester Kosov, Zakhariush Kopystensky, Joseph Nelubovich Tukalsky, Teodozy Vasylevich)³⁴.

The most important centre of Orthodox intellectual life in the final decades of the sixteenth century was the Ostroh Academy. The school was opened by Prince Constantine Ostrohsy in 1580, but reached its full scale of activity only after 1585³⁵. The curriculum was similar to those at West European universities and included the classical *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics) and *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy). Three languages were taught: Ruthenian, Latin, and Greek³⁶. The first rector of the

³² K. Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie pravostavnnye shkoly XVI i nachala XVII v.*, Kazan 1898, p. 287–311; A. Mironowicz, *Bractwa cerkiewne w Rzeczypospolitej*, Białystok 2003, p. 54–55.

³³ K. Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie pravostavnnye shkoly*; *ibid*, *Ostrozhskaia pravoslavnaia shkola*, „Kievskaiia Starina” 1897, vol. II; I. P. Krypiakovich, *Z istorii halytskoho shkilnystva XVI–XVIII st.*, „Ridna shola”, Lviv 1933, no. 2; E. N. Medynsky, *Bratskie shkoly Ukrainy i Bielorusii w XVI–XVII v.*, Moscow 1954; S. Miropolsky, *Ocherk istorii tserkovno-prikhodskoi shkoly ot pervogo ieiia vozniakniia na Rusi do nastoiashchego vremieni*, vyp. III, Sankt-Pietierburg 1985; J. Pavlovsky, *Prikhodskie shkoly w staroi Malorusii i prichiny ich unichtozheniia*, Kiev 1904; A. Savich, *Zapadno-russkie uniatskie shkoly XVI–XVII vv.*, „Trudy Bieloruskogo Gosudarstviennogo Universitieta w Minskie”, Minsk 1922, no. 2–3; A. Wańczura, *Szkolnictwo w Starej Rusi*, Lwów 1932; A. Mironowicz, *Szkolnictwo prawosławne na ziemiach białoruskich w XVI–XVIII w.*, „Białoruskie Zeszyty Historyczne”, no. 2, Białystok 1994, p. 20–34; *ibid*, *Szkolnictwo prawosławne w Rzeczypospolitej*, p. 18–30.

³⁴ M. B. Topolska, *Czytelnik i książka w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim w dobie Renesansu i Baroku*, Wrocław 1984, pp. 37–40, 60–63; *ibid*, *Spółczeństwo i kultura w Wielkim Księstwie Litewskim od XV do XVIII wieku*, Poznań–Zielona Góra 2002; A. Mironowicz, *Kultura prawosławna w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, p. 424.

³⁵ T. Kempa, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogi*, p. 102, 103.

³⁶ I. I. Mytsko, *Ostrozhka sloviano-greco-latinska Akademia (1576–1636)*, Kiev 1990, p. 26; T. Kempa, „Akademia Ostrogi”, in A. Mironowicz, U. Pawluczuk, and P. Chomik, eds., *Szkolnictwo prawosławne w Rzeczypospolitej*, Białystok 2002, p. 55–79.

academy was Herasym Smotrytsky, who was followed later by Sawa Flachyn and Cyril Lukarys, a Greek from Crete. Greeks formed a large part of the faculty: Metropolitan Kizikos, Nicefor Parasios (an envoy of the patriarch of Constantinople), and Emmanuel Achileos (a religious polemicist). Locally recruited lecturers were no less accomplished: George Rohatyniets (the author of *Perestroha*), Wasil Malushytsky (a polemicist), and Yov Kniahitsky. Some of the most outstanding representatives of Ruthenian culture co-operated with the Academy (Fathers Andrea Kurbsky and Artemiush) as well as the protectors of the Orthodox Church in Volhynia – the voievod of Volhynia Alexander Chartorysky, the Elder of Zhytomer Constantine Visniovietsky, the voievod of Braclaw Roman Sangushko. The Academy stayed in close contact with the monasteries in Derman, Dubno, Slutsk, and later Pochaiev. Among the graduates of the academy were: the religious polemicist Zakhariush Kopystensky, hetman Peter Konashevich Sahajdachny, the lord of Lvov Gedeon Bałaban, and the lord of Polotsk Meleti Smotrytsky. The Ostroh Academy connected Byzantine tradition with the model of West European education. It helped to develop Ruthenian culture and literature, especially thanks to its rich library and the publishing of the Church-Slavonic Bible. The experiences of the Ostroh Academy were used by Metropolitan Peter Mohyla when he created the famous Kiev Academy. One must agree with the opinion of Jerzy Kłoczowski, that in the Yahyellonian period the state of education and culture of the Byzantine-Slavic world was no worse than that of the Latin West³⁷. The history of Orthodox culture in the Polish lands during the Yahyellonian period confirms its great role in the formation of Polish civilization. In the Yahyellonian state, cultures and religions co-existed peacefully, an example for contemporary Europe, ravaged by religious conflict.

*

After the Union of Brest (1596), Roman Catholic Poland moved away from Orthodox culture. The Union of Brest undermined the main element of Ruthenian culture – the spiritual unity with Byzantium. The Roman Catholic-Orthodox configuration was joined by a third, intermediary element, midway between the two great traditions. The initiators of the union wrongly assumed that its attractiveness would draw Ruthenians away from the Orthodox Church. Nevertheless, Orthodox culture was not destroyed and even developed new forms better suited to the reality of the seventeenth century. Consequently, the Union of Brest turned not against Orthodoxy as a whole, but against Orthodoxy in Poland. As a result, it brought some small gain for the Roman Catholic Church. but it failed to solve any of the country's internal problems. In Poland, the distance between the Roman Catholic elite and the Ruthenian culture and Orthodoxy deepened. The

³⁷ J. Kłoczowski, *Młodsza Europa. Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia w kręgu cywilizacji chrześcijańskiej średniowiecza*, Warsaw 1998, p. 418, 419.

Roman Catholics still felt closer to Protestants brought up in Western culture than to the Ruthenians, who followed the Byzantine traditions, but were ever closer to Polish culture. This fact had also some positive outcomes for the Ruthenian society for the Orthodox elite evolved a new cultural position. The pressure from Uniats and Roman Catholics on Ruthenian Orthodoxy strengthened the Orthodox Church. The writings of Stanisław Hozjusz, Benedict Herbst, Piotr Skarga or Hipatsy Potsi provoked important discussions over many questions of dogma, law, and ritual. The polemic with the Uniats gave the Orthodox side a foundation for working out a clear view of its religious doctrine and cultural identity. The Uniat version of the Ruthenian culture influenced the defence mechanisms of Orthodox culture in Poland. On one hand, Orthodox culture and education became more engaged in religious polemics, while on the other hand, it reached more often for Latin models.

One example of this tendency in Orthodox culture is the appearance of the many printing houses and schools opened by church brotherhoods. In the first half of the seventeenth century, the Ruthenian nobility became more engaged in cultural patronage of the Orthodox Church. This process is most visible in the nobles' patronage of monasteries. After the Union of Brest, the Orthodox Church lost important monasteries to the Uniats, but many new monasteries were founded. Research on eastern monastic culture shows that most of the monasteries in the first half of the seventeenth century remained Orthodox. The Orthodox Church kept most of its monasteries in Kiev, Vilnius, Chernihov, Podhortse, Pinsk, Turkovitse, Human, Uniov, Sokal, Pochaiov, Podhorodyszch, Mozyrz, Lvov, Korsun, Brest, Belsk, and over a hundred other places. By the end of the seventeenth century, dozens of new monasteries were created in the Ruthenian lands of the Kingdom of Poland and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania³⁸.

The variety of liturgical orders in Poland's Orthodox Church served as confirmation of the rich traditions which formed Orthodox culture. In the first half of the seventeenth century, this culture was still permeated with Greek, Latin, Bulgarian, Serbian and Muscovite influences. Examples may be found in liturgical books – the *Slużebnik* (*Sluzhebnik*) (1604) and the *Trebnik* (1606), which despite being based on Greek models contained local traditions. Similar features may be found in the *Czasosłow* (*Tsasoslov*) (1602), the *Trebnik* and the *Molitwosłow*

³⁸ M. Hrushevsky, *Duhhovna Ukraina*, Kiev 1994, p. 316–322; M. Vavrik, „Narys rozvytku i stanu Vasylianskoho Chyna XVII–XX st.st.,” *Analecta Ordinis p. Basili Magni*, part. II, vol. X, Rome 1979, pp. 189–209; H. Litwin, „Dobra ziemskie Cerkwi Prawosławnej i Kościoła katolickiego obu obrządków na Kijowszczyźnie w świetle akt skarbowych i sądowych 1569–1648” *Rocznik Teologiczny*, 32, no. 2 (1990), pp. 187–208; A. Mironowicz, „Życie monastyczne w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej,” [in:] A. Mironowicz, U. Pawluczuk i P. Chomik, eds., *Życie monastyczne w Rzeczypospolitej*, Białystok 2001, pp. 27–53; *ibid*, *Kościół prawosławny w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, Białystok 2001, pp. 116–118.

(*Molitvoslov*) (1606) created in Ostroh. These books were repeatedly published by brotherhood printing houses in Lvov and Vilnius³⁹.

The greatest development of Orthodox education and culture took place when Petr Mohyla became metropolitan. Thus Orthodox culture developed when not a Ruthenian, but a member of a polonised Moldavian family took the central place in the Kiev hierarchy. He initiated the establishment of the famous Kiev-Mohylev Academy – a modern school taking modeled on the Jesuit colleges. His actions caused an uproar among an Orthodox clergy loath to accept Latin examples. The new school was accused of not betraying Orthodoxy. Monastic clergy could not understand the need to link Western culture with the “Greek faith”. Fortunately, this issue was perceived differently by the Orthodox elites surrounding Peter Mohyla, which led to merging the monastery and Kiev brotherhood schools into a single institution. The Kiev school followed the example of European schools by teaching the classical languages: Latin and Greek. The school consisted of five lower classes: *infima*, grammar, syntax, rhetoric and poetry, as well as a higher class of philosophy⁴⁰. Among the lecturers of the school were: Sylvester Kosov, Izaiah Trokhimovich Kozlovsky, Ignat Aksienovich Starushych, Sofroniush Pochapsky, Antoni Patsevsky, Jazep Kananovich Garbatsky⁴¹. In 1632, Izaiah Kozlovsky, a philosophy lecturer from Lvov became the rector of the Academy. The “Mohylev Atheneum,” which gathered outstanding humanists around the metropolitan, created the foundation for the Orthodox academy, along the lines of a Western European education⁴².

Latin influences did not mean that the school would give up its Orthodox character. The school’s rector and polemicist defended the school’s character in his 1635 work, *Exegesis, to jest danie sprawy o szkołach kijowskich i winnickich. (Exegis, or giving the cause of Kiev and Winno school)*. He argued that he did not support the Uniats nor any other dissenters. “Those who now learn in Kiev and Winno schools are from parents born into the Greek faith: they learned in Roman Catholic academies in Poland, Lithuania, and the [Holy Roman] Empire. They teach in Latin. never hurting the ancient Greek religion.” The Belarusian bishop Kosov was happy that “poor Ruthenia can no longer be called stupid. In Poland, Latin is a necessity. When the poor Ruthenian happens to be in the Parliament, he cannot move a single step without Latin.” Further he pointed out the benefits the schools brought to the church. “Your churches will therefore be filled with the faithful, devout, and learned.: (“Twoje stąd cerkwie świaszczennikami,

³⁹ A. Naumow, *Wiara i historia*, Cracow 1996, p. 21.

⁴⁰ K. Kharlampovich, *Zapadno-russkie...*, p. 362–362.

⁴¹ Makarii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, vol. XI, Sankt-Petersburg 1882, p. 13.

⁴² A. Jabłonowski, *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohylańska*, Cracow 1899–1900, p. 86–89.

przy bogobojności umiejętnymi, napełnione będą.”)⁴³. The discussion over the Church Slavonic language as a literary and liturgic language in the Orthodox Church lasted throughout the entire seventeenth century. Its use was regarded as a defence of the very essence of the Orthodox Church and Ruthenian national tradition. It has to be noted that the problem of the liturgical language had been an ongoing issue since the Reformation. The possibility of adding to it Latin or Ruthenian texts caused fears of lose of the identity of the Orthodox Church in some of the clergy and faithful. The Kiev-Mohylev Academy became the most important Orthodox intellectual centre, influencing all of Eastern Europe. Its graduates played a special role in the life of the Russian Orthodox Church in the synodal period in the eighteenth century.

The “Mohylev Atheneum,” which gathered outstanding humanists, surrounded metropolitan Peter Mohyla. It is worth noting that the Orthodox hierarchy was strongly connected with Polish culture, because of their education. Peter Mohyla’s and his successors’ activities are proof of the existence of a distinct Orthodox culture in the Polish lands, which formed when the Ruthenian Church was threatened. The awareness of being Orthodox led to a parting of the Ruthenian Orthodox with the post-Byzantine and Muscovite isolationism and opened the Ruthenian society to the achievements of Western culture. As a result, the defence of Orthodoxy was ironically realised with the aid of elements from Latin culture, but always while preserving its own religious tradition. Including the Latin language and customs in Orthodox culture was simply a method for defending it fro marginalisation in cultural and political life. This fact had significant meaning for the liturgical and administrative reforms prepared at the Kiev synod in 1640. They lead to a rebirth of Orthodox culture and made it equal to the Latin-Polish culture. Discussions over ritual and liturgical reforms continued in 1642–1643 in the hierarchy’s sobor in Jasi. As a result of the decisions reached there. Metropolitan Petr Mohyla wrote in 1645 the catechism *Zebranie krótkiej nauki o artykułach wiary prawosławnej katolickiej jako Cerkiew Wschodnia Apostolska uczy...*, which was accepted by most of the Orthodox hierarchy⁴⁴. His reforms revitalised the spiritual life and enriched Orthodox culture in the second half of the seventeenth century.

During the rule of Peter Mohyla, the remains of Pechersk monks found in closer and more distant caverns were canonised. Their relics were rediscovered and numerous miraculous healings confirmed their holiness. Mohyla understood

⁴³ Makarii, *Istoriia Russkoi Tserkvi*, vol. XI, p. 422; A. Mironowicz, *Sylwester Kosow, biskup białoruski, metropolita kijowski*, Białystok 1999, p. 9–12.

⁴⁴ A. Naumow, *Wiara i historia*, Cracow 1996, pp. 34–36; A. Mironowicz, *Prawosławie i unia za panowania Jana Kazimierza*, Białystok 1996, pp. 67–72; *ibid*, *Kościół prawosławny w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, Białystok 2001, pp. 119–122.

the necessity to spread the knowledge of their sanctity among the Orthodox people. The spirituality of the Pechersk fathers was to use defend Orthodox dogma and to influence the Ruthenian nobility to stay with the “Greek faith”. Therefore, the metropolitan gave Sylvester Kosov the task of describing the life and achievements of each of the Pechersk “podwiźniks” (podvizhnic) and the miracles connected with them. *Paterykon, albo zhyvoty svietykh Ojtsov Pecherskikh...* became the basis for the monks’ canonisation⁴⁵. Lord Sylvester supplemented the *Paterykon Kijovsko-Pechersky* with a work on the Orthodox origins of the Kiev metropolitan and it always remained true to the “Greek faith”. This part of the *Paterykon* was a polemic with the work of the Uniat historian Leon Kreuza, *O jednosti kostsielnej* (Vilnius, 1617). The Uniat polemicist underestimated the close contacts of the Kiev metropolitan with the patriarchate of Constantinople between the eleventh and the sixteenth centuries⁴⁶. To oppose this anti-Orthodox theory, Kosov supplemented the *Paterykon* with a catalogue of Kiev metropolitans. The *Chronologia o prawosławnych metropolitach ruskich* was to defy any Uniat claims to the Kiev metropolia⁴⁷. When presenting the history of the Kiev metropolitan, Kosov showed great talent as a historian and theologian. His work was re-edited and published by a Pechersk monk, Atanazy Kolnofojsky, in 1638 r. This re-edition, supplemented with descriptions of sixty-four miracles, which took place as a result of the saints’ relics between 1594 and 1638, was the second stage in the monks’ canonization. The process was finalized by the bishops’ sobor in Kiev in 1643⁴⁸.

Under the rule of Petr Mohyla, Juliana, the Holshansky princess (1534–1550) and Sophia Slutska (1575–1612) were canonized⁴⁹. After 1640, the relics of Mercury Smolensky, a holy martyr from the thirteenth century, were revealed⁵⁰. Atanazy Bresky (1597–1648) was most active during this period for he was head of the Kupiatytsky and Brest monasteries and a defender of Orthodoxy. The *ighumen* of the St. Simon monastery in Brest supported the uprising of Bohdan Khmelnytsky, for which he was killed by Polish soldiers⁵¹.

⁴⁵ L. Nadzyńska, ed., *Pateryk Kijovsko-Peczerski czyli opowieści o świętych ojcach w pieczarach kijowskich położonych*, Wrocław 1993.

⁴⁶ *Pamiętniki polemickiej literatury z Zapadnoi Rusi*, kn. 1 [*Ruskaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka*, vol. IV], Sankt-Petersburg 1878, pp. 223–248.

⁴⁷ *Seventeenth-Century Writings on the Kievan Caves Monastery. With an Introduction by Paulina Lewin*, Cambridge 1987, pp. 97; A. Naumow, *Wiara i historia*, Cracow 1996, p. 13.

⁴⁸ E. Golubinsky, *Istoriia kanonizatsyi sviatykh v Russkoi Tserkvi*, Moscow 1998, p. 210.

⁴⁹ A. Mironowicz, „Kult świętych na Białorusi,” *Wiadomości Polskiego Autokefalicznego Kościoła Prawosławnego*, no. 4 (1992), pp. 12–13.

⁵⁰ E. Golubinsky, *Istoriia kanonizatsyi*, p. 213–214; A. Mironowicz, *Kultura prawosławna w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, p. 428–429.

⁵¹ D. Rostoytsky, *Zhyttaa svietykh*, vol. I, Moscow 1908, p. 5–29.

The canonizations took place at the height of the Uniate-Orthodox polemics and while there were ongoing discussions on creating a Kiev patriarchate. At the time, Sylvester Kosov wrote *Didaskalia, albo nauka* (Kutein, 1637). This work, similar to most theological works written by Orthodox clergymen in Poland, created an unfriendly reaction from the Moscow clergy. Kosov was accused of “Latin heresy” and of abandoning the Orthodox tradition. *Didaskalia* were written as a catechism in the form of questions and answers. It was first presented by the author himself on 19 October 1637 in the local sobor in Mohylev⁵². *Didaskalia* added to the materials for the Orthodox clergy in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The fragments concerning the nature of God and the Holy Trinity became a basis for the religious polemics with Arians and Anti-trinitarians. Sylvester Kosov indicated the necessity of developing monastic life as the highest form of serving God. The bishop summoned the faithful to worship the relics of saints and miraculous icons. According to the author of the *Didaskalia*, it is to be used as one of the forms of prayer and religiousness. He stressed the need to continually pray for the dead, use the cross, and to make the sign of the cross. The work was supposed to strengthen the Orthodox faith and was popular among believers.

*

Within ten years as metropolitan, Sylvester Kosov (1647–1657), supported the activity of the many printing houses and schools. He understood the need to develop the education of the Orthodox people and their religious consciousness. He initiated the printing in the Kupiatytsky monastery of: the *Tryfalogion* (1647), the *Psalter* (1650), the *New Testament with Psalter* (1652), *Bucvar* (1653), *Lexicon* (1653). The Mohylev brotherhood printing house published *Bucvar* (1648); its Vilnius counterpart: *Modlitevnik* (1652) and *Bucvar* (1652). Liturgical books and handbooks were printed in Kiev’s Caves Monastery. Just looking through the list of publications demonstrates Sylvester Kosov’s interest in education within the Orthodox Church. He supported the creation of new monastery and parish schools. He was especially fond of the Kiev-Mohylev Academy, which continued its founders *pro gramme* [??] There were some restrictions on the college’s work in 1651, when its buildings were devastated during the war. Despite material losses during the term of rector Innocent Gizel (1645–1650), there were no changes to the order and range of lectures. At the same time, future outstanding thinkers, such as Simeon Polotski or Ioanitsi Galatovsky, graduated from the Kiev school. The Mohylev College received many bequests and the bishops of

⁵² I. Savierchanka, Silviestr Kosaū, *Belaruski historychny chasopis*, no 3 (1995), p. 180–181; A. Mironowicz, *Sylvester Kosov*, p. 17–18.

Peremysl, Vitebsk, Lutsk, and Khelm promised to support the school financially on a yearly basis⁵³.

It is worth noting how religious culture developed among the Orthodox people in the 17th century. The increase in religiousness was partly caused by the worship of saints and miraculous icons. The faithful were drawn to the relics of St. Yov of Pochaiev. The *Ighumen* of the Pochaiev Lavra died on 28 November 1651 and already on 28 October 1659 he was canonized⁵⁴. Under the influence of the Latin Church, the baroque form of religiousness developed. At the same time, the threat from other religions mobilised the Orthodox clergy. Religious education led to the propagation of religion and an increased religious consciousness. For the first time, religiousness was widely aided by knowledge of the written word. Religious chants, the cult of saints, and church fairs. In times of frequent wars and elemental cataclysms, manifesting one's religiousness became part of the religious tradition. The forming of the mystical trend in the Orthodoxy was greatly influenced by monasteries, which significantly influenced the attitudes and behaviors of the faithful. This factor became more important in times of crisis, especially during the uprising of Bohdan Khmelnytsky. Orthodoxy started to be invoked by the, so far religiously indifferent, Cossacks, who took it upon themselves the weight of defending the "Greek faith" from the second half of the seventeenth century.

* * *

Little can be said about Orthodox culture during the rule of Poland's Saxon dynasty in the early eighteenth century. The religiousness of the Orthodox is not clear from the available sources since it stemmed from the inner life, which, in the case of the Orthodox, was often kept secret. Legal restrictions discouraged openly demonstrating the Orthodox faith. The baroque and Sarmatian religiousness of the Polish nobility contrasted with the religious attitudes of the Orthodox burghers and peasants. After left-bank Ukraine was separated from the Commonwealth, the few remaining members of the Orthodox elite were more likely to look to Kiev and other foreign education centres, than try to create their own. With no Orthodox seminaries and theology schools within the Commonwealth, the clergy's educational level became a significant problem.

One of the characteristic features of the religiousness of the Orthodox people in the Kingdom of Poland and Grand Duchy of Lithuania was the cult of the Virgin Mary. Between 1704 and 1714, there was an epidemic in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The passage of troops from the Northern War spread the

⁵³ A. Jabłonowski, *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohyńska. Zakres cywilizacji zachodniej na Rusi*, Cracow 1899–1900, p. 134–135; A. Mironowicz, *Bractwa cerkiewne w Rzeczypospolitej*, p. 64–65.

⁵⁴ E. Golubinsky, *Istoriia kanonizatsyi*, p. 214, 221.

disease over Podlasie and Hrodno regions. The epidemic decimated many towns and villages⁵⁵. In this difficult period, many people prayed for the mercy of the Mother of God. The development of the Virgin Mary cult in the beginning of the eighteenth century is connected with the miraculous manifestations of the Virgin at many pilgrimage sites. The worship of miraculous icons was also connected with the deep religiousness of society, ostensibly manifesting its Orthodox faith. The importance of pilgrimage sites increased, as did the role of sanctuaries in the life of the Orthodox Church. Many icons were famous for miraculous healing (in Smolensk, Zhyrovitse, Pochaiev, Kiev, Kupiaty and Korsun), as were even copies of these icons, which attracted thousands of pilgrims. Pilgrims visited the sanctuaries with the icons of the Virgin Mary of Khelm, Borun, Borkulabov, Halich, Horodysh, Kodensk, Kołozhsk, Minsk, Ostrobrama, Pinsk, Trechemirov, Vitebsk and Zasław⁵⁶. In Poland, the best known and most famous for their miracles were the icons in the monasteries in Zhyrovitse and Pochaiev⁵⁷. Apart from these well known sites of worship, new sites appeared, of local and regional importances. The Virgin Mary cult developed especially at the time of the Confederation of Bar. Faith in the miraculous powers of the icons of the Mother of God reached wide masses of the Polish and Ruthenian people. It became common practice among the Orthodox, the Roman Catholics and Uniats. This cult expressed itself in numerous pilgrimages to holy sites, mystical experiences, permanent services, prayers of thanks, and religious chants.

In Podlasie, most of the sanctuaries with miraculous icons of the Mother of God were created around 1710. This period saw the development of such cult sites as Piatienka near Folvark Tylyvitskikh, Svieta Voda near Vasilkov, Knorydy, Krynochka, Stary Kornin and Svieta Gora Grabarka⁵⁸. The history of these sites was connected with the miraculous manifestations of the Mother of God or of

⁵⁵ S. Namaczyńska, *Kronika klęsk elementarnych w Polsce i w krajach sąsiednich w latach 1648–1696*, vol. I, Lwów 1937; I. Grochowska, *Klęski elementarne w Polsce na przełomie XVII–XVIII wieku*, „Białostoczczyzna”, 1992, no. 2, p. 2–9.

⁵⁶ L. Haroshka, *Kult Baharodzitsy na Bielorusi*, „Bozhym shlahkom”, Y. VIII, Paris 1954, no. 58–62; G. Luzhnitsky, *Slovník Chudotvornikh Bohorodichnykh ikon Ukrainy*, p. 153–188; S. Sniesoriewa, *Ziemia zhyzn Priesviatoi Bogoroditsy i opisaniie sviatykh chudotvornykh iete ikon*, Jaroslavl 1994; A. Mironowicz, *Kult ikon Matki Bożej na Białorusi*, „Białostocki Przegląd Kresowy”, vol. V, ed. J. F. Nosowicz, Białystok 1996, p. 137–141.

⁵⁷ See A. Fridrich, *Historia obrazów Najświętszej Maryi Panny w Polsce*, vol. I–IV, Cracow 1911; B. Pylak and Cz. Krakowiak, eds., *Niepokalana. Kult Matki Bożej na ziemiach polskich w XIX w.*, Lublin 1988; E. Jabłońska-Deptuła, „Kult maryjny w Polsce XIX wieku,” *Więź*, no. 5(61) (1963), p. 43–51; S. Litak, *Od reformacji do oświecenia. Kościół katolicki w Polsce nowożytnej*, Lublin 1994, pp. 218–220; W. Niżyński, *Teologia kultu maryjnego w katolicyzmie*, ed. W. Eisele, *Kult Maryjny w Kościele rzymskokatolickim w Polsce i w Rosyjskim Kościele prawosławnym w Rosji*, Warsaw–Moscow 1989.

⁵⁸ A. Mironowicz, „Grabarka,” *Więź*, no. 5(295) (1983), pp. 153–156; A. Radziukiewicz, *Święta*

her icons. Usually a manifestation was accompanied by miraculous healings. In the Eastern tradition, the Mother of God remained the Mother of humanity, its supporter and protector. The Eastern Church venerates the Mother of God as more honourable than cherubs and seraphim, higher than all of Creation. Therefore, the faithful addressed their prayers to her and her icons⁵⁹.

It is worth noting that, apart from the worship of miraculous icons, the cult of newly canonized martyrs also developed in the Orthodox community. This cult was often anti-Uniate. In the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, especially popular was the cult of St. Gabriel Zabłudovsky. The canonisation of the martyr took place only after 1720. However, up to 1755, his relics lay in the Monastery of the Sleeping of Holy Mary in Zabłudov and later in the Holy Trinity monastery in Slutsk⁶⁰. Equally popular was the cult of the martyr Makary Kanievsky, canonised after 1688. The increase in the popularity of these cults was often connected with transferring the relics of local patrons. Such was the case with the transfer of the relics of St. Juliana Slutska to Kiev in 1718⁶¹. The worship of local saints increased the religious consciousness of the Orthodox faithful and helped preserve their cultural identity. Visitations to Uniate parishes showed that despite the difficult legal situation of the Orthodox Church the latinising (after the Zamosts synod in 1720) Uniate variety of Catholicism in some of Poland's eastern areas lost its faithful to the "Greek faith." In Zhytomyr, divorced people re-married in the Orthodox Church⁶². The Uniates were drawn to Orthodoxy by its unchanged eastern tradition and ritualism. This appeal confirms the religious consciousness of the Ruthenian people, who were attached to their tradition and culture.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, the Orthodox Church slowly lost its faithful to the Catholic and Uniate churches. Furthermore, the number of Orthodox parishes in Poland diminished after the first partition of 1772. The religious and cultural life of the Orthodox Church during the reign of Stanisław August Poniatowski (1764–1795) was based mostly in monasteries

Góra Grabarka, Białystok 1993; A. Mironowicz, „Piatienka,” *Białostoczczyzna*, no. 2(6), (1987), pp. 19–25; *ibid.*, „Cuda zapomniane,” *Przegląd Prawosławny*, no. 8 (110) (1994), pp. 8–9; L. Adamczuk i A. Mironowicz, ed., *Kościół prawosławny w Polsce, dawniej i dziś*, Warsaw 1993, p. 133–136; A. Mironowicz, *Księga cudów przed ikoną Matki Bożej w Starym Korminie dokonanych*, Białystok 1997, pp. 1–190.

⁵⁹ A. Mironowicz, „Kult ikon Matki Bożej na Białorusi”, *Białostocki Przegląd Kresowy*, 5 (1996), pp. 137–141.

⁶⁰ A. Mironowicz, „Święty Gabriel Zabłudowski,” *Wiadomości Polskiego Autokefalicznego Kościoła Prawosławnego*, 17, no. 1 (1987), pp. 32–38; *ibid.*, *Życie monastyczne na Podlasiu*, p. 100–102.

⁶¹ E. Golubinsky, *Istoriia kanonizatsyi...*, p. 220–221; A. Mironowicz, „Kult świętych na Białorusi,” *Wiadomości Polskiego Autokefalicznego Kościoła Prawosławnego*, 22, no. 4 (1992), pp. 6–21

⁶² S. Litak, *Od reformacji do oświecenia*, p. 213.

for these religious institutions showed great resilience and preserved the Orthodox faith more effectively than the regular parishes. For example, the monastery of Zhabotyn was known for having miraculous icons of the Sleeping Holy Mary and St. Onufry the Great. The surdetsky monastery had the miraculous icon of Holy Mary⁶³.

One significant problem influencing the religious life of the Orthodox people was the low level of education of its clergy. Some clergy were educated in Russia, mostly in Kiev, but most of lacked an education appropriate to their calling. The monastic schools in Vilnius, Slutsk, and Belsk, supported by local church brotherhoods, could not fill the needs of the whole Orthodox community⁶⁴. Only the Slutsk school, reformed by bishop George Konisky in 1785, met the standards of church seminaries. Due to their lack of proper education, many monks had no holy orders. However, the church brotherhoods played a major role in the religious life of the Orthodox community. In the second half of the eighteenth century, they had to take up the burden of defending the spiritual and material interests of the Orthodox Church. The brotherhoods, although they were not as large as in earlier times, still functioned at most monasteries and Orthodox parishes. The Pinsk congregation was joined by the representatives of 17 different brotherhoods. Nonetheless, their activity across the Orthodox Church was not as dynamic as before⁶⁵.

The creators of the Pinsk Congregation understood the role of schools in the life of the church and in forming religious attitudes. In their decisions of 3 July 1791 reforming the Orthodox Church in Poland, they included a passage concerning the functioning of Orthodox Church schools. They were to educate the children of the clergy, nobility, and burghers “and even peasant children, according to state laws.” “The bachelors can be the grandfathers, who read and write in Polish and Ruthenian, but should they be greatly occupied with church services, special bachelors should be hired”. The parsons and heads of monasteries were responsible for organizing and providing for the parish schools⁶⁶. The Highest Consistory appointed by the Pinsk Congregation ordered the heads of monasteries on 9 December 1791 to organize parish schools and teachings on the Orthodox faith. The Church authorities began preparing handbooks and extra materials for

⁶³ A. Mironowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, p. 269–270.

⁶⁴ A. Mironowicz, *Szkolnictwo prawosławne na ziemiach białoruskich w XVI–XVIII wieku*, p. 20–34.

⁶⁵ A. Mironowicz, *Bractwa cerkiewne w Rzeczypospolitej*, p. 77–85.

⁶⁶ E. Sakowicz, *Kościół prawosławny w Polsce w epoce Sejmu Wielkiego 1788–1792*, Warsaw 1935, pp. 205–206. A. Mironowicz, „Cerkiew prawosławna na terenie Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w latach 1772–1795,” in M. Biskup, ed., *Ziemie Północne Rzeczypospolitej Polsko-Litewskiej w dobie rozbiorowej 1772–1815*, Warsaw–Toruń 1996, pp. 81–94; *ibid.*, *Ihumen Sawa Palmowski*, Białystok 2001, pp. 33–62.

teaching religion. These school reforms helped to promote education within the Orthodox community. This process did not last long: the Polish-Russian war and the second and third partitions of Poland undid the decisions of the Pinsk congregation, including the educational reforms.

*

In analyzing the history of the eastern Christian culture in Poland until 1795 one should note its extraordinary development in the sixteenth century. The change in religious relations was not only the result of the removal by the last Yahyellonians of all restrictions on the Orthodox Church, but of a change in the religious situation in the entire Commonwealth: Poland became a free state of Polish, Lithuanian, and Ruthenian nobility. Ruthenian political elites played a major, national role in these events. The importance of Orthodox nobles in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and the Ruthenian parts of the Kingdom of Poland became clear during this period. A similar role was played in these same region by the Ruthenian patricians.

Simultaneously, the Orthodox community made important cultural achievements, often underestimated by some Polish scholars. The first publications in Poland, printed in Cracow in 1491–1492, were Cyrillic liturgical books produced for the Orthodox faithful. The pioneer of printing in Belarus was Francisk Skoryna from Polotsk. The reforms of the Orthodox Church were connected with the creation of printing houses and schools working for the Orthodox Church. These positive changes in the Orthodox Church, although not as great as the post-Tridentine, Roman Catholic Church, nevertheless led to a rebirth of religious life among the clergy and faithful. Instead of appreciating the value of this burgeoning Orthodox culture, the Polish royal authorities promoted the Counter-Reformation and the predominance dominance of Latin culture.

The tolerant attitude in the eastern borderlands, formed over centuries, were shaken during the Counter-Reformation, when Poland warred with Orthodox Muscovite, Muslim Turkey, Protestant Sweden, and multi-religious Transylvania (Siedmiogród). The stereotype of the Pole as Catholic as well as the myth of Poland as the fore post of Christianity formed then⁶⁷. Fortunately, these negative tendencies weakened during the Polish Enlightenment in the reign of Stanislaw August. During his reign, Poland became a multi-religious state, as in earlier times. This multi-ethnic and multi-faith structure appeared mostly in the eastern regions of the country⁶⁸. The change in the Polish policy towards the Orthodox people, as expressed in the attempt to form an independent Orthodox Church

⁶⁷ J. Tazbir, *Polskie przedmurze chrześcijańskiej Europy. Mity a rzeczywistość historyczna*, Warsaw 1987.

⁶⁸ S. Litak, *Od Reformacji do Oświecenia. Kościół katolicki w Polsce nowożytnej*, Lublin 1994, pp. 33–134; A. Mironowicz, „Specyfika tolerancji wyznaniowej na kresach wschodnich Rzeczy-

structure in the Great Sejm (1788–1792), was a return to the sixteenth-century tradition of peaceful co-existence of cultures and religions. During the Polish Enlightenment, the multi-national character of Poland was acknowledged as were the ruinous consequences for Poland of promoting a single religion.

*

The history of Orthodox culture in Poland demonstrates that two great religious traditions: eastern (Byzantine-Ruthenian) and western (Latin) – met in the country at an early date. Orthodoxy remained a constant element of the religious structure of the country and even, in some regions, the dominant faith. The eastern Christian tradition influenced all aspects of the life of the Ruthenian people and necessarily had an impact on the culture of the entire country. Forms of coexistence developed in Poland, which meant that for many centuries Orthodoxy was a Polish faith, not a foreign religion. This picture of the history of Orthodox culture in Poland is key to an understanding of Orthodoxy's place in Europe. The area where two Christian traditions met on such a scale contains much evidence for scholars. The positive and negative elements of this meeting point of cultures became part of the historical heritage of our country. In this context, it is so difficult to imagine the history of Poland without the Eastern Church culture. A consciousness of the constant presence of this great Christian tradition is fundamental to understanding the history of our country and the religious and cultural identity of its nations.

Kultura prawosławna w Polsce do końca XVIII wieku

Historia kultury prawosławnej na ziemiach dawnej Polski ukazuje nam, że na jej terenie doszło do spotkania dwóch wielkich tradycji religijno-kulturowych: wschodniej (bizantyjsko-ruskiej) i zachodniej (łacińskiej). Prawosławie było stałym elementem struktury wyznaniowej kraju, w niektórych jego regionach religią dominującą. Wschodnia tradycja chrześcijańska zakorzeniła się we wszystkich formach życia ludności ruskiej i wpłynęła na oblicze kulturowe wszystkich mieszkańców państwa. W kraju zdołano wytworzyć takie normy współżycia, gdzie przez wiele stuleci prawosławie nie było wyznaniem obcym lecz własnym.

Zaprezentowany obraz dziejów kultury prawosławia w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej ma istotne znaczenie w zrozumieniu jej specyfiki w strukturze wyznaniowej

pospolitej,” in K. Krzysztofka i A. Sadowski, eds., *Pogranicza etniczne w Europie. Harmonia i konflikty*, Białystok 2001, p. 163–173; *ibid.*, „Tolerancja wyznaniowa na kresach wschodnich Rzeczypospolitej,” in J. Staszewski, K. Mikulski i J. Dumanowski, eds., *Między zachodem a wschodem. Studia z dziejów Rzeczypospolitej w epoce nowożytnej*, Toruń 2002, pp. 339–347.

Europy. Obszar, na którym na tak szeroką skalę doszło do spotkania dwóch tradycji chrześcijańskich, wschodniej i zachodniej, zawiera w sobie ogromny bagaż doświadczeń. Pozytywne i negatywne oblicza styków cywilizacyjnych stały się dziedzictwem historycznym naszego państwa. W tym kontekście jakże trudno jest wyobrazić dzieje Rzeczypospolitej do końca XVIII wieku bez kultury Kościoła wschodniego.

Key words: Orthodox Culture, Poland, XVIII Century