

Teresa Chynczewska-Hennel

(Uniwersytet w Białymstoku)

## THE KYIV-MOHYLA ACADEMY FROM THE POLISH POINT OF VIEW

Dedicated to the memory  
of Professor Paulina Lewin  
(1922–2015)

This point of view is presented here through the prism of the approach of Polish historians to the history and importance of the Academy<sup>1</sup>. There is no doubt that one of the most important publications is still topical today, namely “Academia Kijowsko-Mohylańska. Zarys historyczny na tle rozwoju ogólnego cywiliacji zachodniej na Rusi” written by Aleksander Walerian Jabłonowski (1829–1913). This outstanding author studied Slavic Philology at the University of Kiev. He also wrote many books and articles devoted to modern Ukrainian-Ruthenian history. He published his “Academia Kijowsko-Mohylańska” on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of the foundation of the Jagiellonian University in Cracow. Unfortunately, later on, no publications by Polish historians appeared for quite a long time<sup>2</sup>.

The first author to break this silence was an outstanding and world-famous Polish scholar Ryszard Łużny (1927–1998), who published in 1966 his doctoral dissertation, which has been cited until today: “Pisarze kręgu Akademii Kijowsko-Mohylańskiej a literatura polska. Z dziejów związków kulturalnych polsko-wschodniosłowiańskich w XVII–XVIII w.” (Kraków 1966)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Chynczewska-Hennel T.* Akademia Kijowsko-Mohylańska w polskiej literaturze historycznej // Київська Академія. – Вип. 2–3. – К., 2006. – С. 197–207. The present article is an altered and updated version.

<sup>2</sup> With the exception of two important works: *Andrusiak M.* Sprawa Patriarchatu Kijowskiego za Władysława IV // Prace historyczne w 30-lecie działalności profesorskiej Stanisława Zakrzewskiego. – Lwów, 1934. – S. 265–285; *Wojtyła A.* De tentaminibus novae “Unionis Universalis” in Poloniae – Lithuaniae anno 1636 factis // Orientalia Christiana Periodica. – 1952. – Vol. XVIII, nos. 1–2. – P. 158–197; Jabłonowski’s book was greatly appreciated by Professor Ihor Ševčenko: The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla // Harvard Ukrainian Studies // (The Kiev Mohyla Academy, Commemorating the 350-th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)). – 1984. – Vol. VIII, No. ½. – P. 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Kawecka M.* Wkład profesora Ryszarda Łużnego do ukrainoznawstwa polskiego // Warszawskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze. T. 19–20 (Studia Ucrainica) – Warszawa, 2005. – S. 46–53; *Mokry W.* Profesor Ryszard Łużny – ukrainista // Słowianie Wschodni. Duchowość – mentalność – kultura. Księga Jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Ryszardowi Łużnemu w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin / Wyd. A. Rażny, D. Piwowarska. – Kraków, 1997. – S. 14–20; *Łużny R.* Autor o sobie samym, czyli szkice do biografii // Ryszard Łużny. Spis publikacji / Wyd. G. Przebinda, J. Świeży. – Kraków, 1997. – S. 68–86.

It was a breakthrough work in Poland, since, on the one hand, under political conditions prevailing at that time it tackled the issues which the leaders in the Kremlin were unwilling to see, and on the other hand it showed very tactically the educational roots of the Muscovite – or already Russian – intellectual elite of the second half of the 17th century. Obviously, these roots were in the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, this unusual Orthodox didactic institution in the territory of the First Polish Commonwealth. It was hardly tolerated by the decision-makers of the so-called Marxist science in the Soviet interpretation when somebody undertook research on problems relating to Western influences in Christianity and in Eastern Culture. The links of Petro Mohyla and of his collaborators and students with the Ukrainian Baroque, which subsequently influenced, through its representatives, Russia's political, Orthodox and literary life, were very hard to accept at that time. Although history never repeats itself exactly, one may have an impression that today we can also observe a similar phenomenon in different realities in Russia. As described by the author of the biography of Professor Łużny, with reference to the 1960s, during the period of colonial treatment of Ukrainian culture in the Soviet Union, the research work of this prominent and courageous scholar was a truly pioneering study; it preceded the translation from German into Polish of Endre Angyal's work entitled "The World of the Slavic Baroque" published in 1972 <sup>1</sup>.

Ryszard Łużny devoted much of his attention to the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Ukrainian Baroque and to the writings of the Academy's lecturers and students, also in many other of his works in which he developed the threads included in his book. Here is a group of his heroes: first of all, Petro Mohyla, Symeon Połocki, Dmytro Tuptalo, Stefan Jaworski, Łazar Baranovych, and Teofan Prokopovych. The latter always took interest in the Polish-Ukrainian ties, literary traditions and in the aspects of religiousness of the Ukrainian Baroque. Polish-Ukrainian-Russian ties can also be clearly seen in the poetry of Symeon Połocki. The latter adored the Polish Renaissance poet Jan Kochanowski. This theme was excellently tackled by Ryszard Łużny in one of his articles in which he made a comparative analysis of two Psalters: the "Rhymed Psalter" by Symeon Połocki and the "David's Psalter" by Jan Kochanowski <sup>2</sup>.

Among many other publications of this scholar, let us mention the problem of the so-called "Ruthenian chamaleontes," who, in the opinion of Petro Mohyla, were responsible for the Church split in Ruthenia. Mohyla presented in his "Lithos," as Professor Łużny held, a collective portrait of people who turned away from the Orthodox teaching. This criticism of the phenomenon of "chameleonism" in the Ruthenian Orthodox Church was made by Mohyla on two levels. The first one criticized human attitudes, whereas the other one

<sup>1</sup> Kawecka M. Wkład profesora Ryszarda Łużnego. – S. 48–49.

<sup>2</sup> Łużny R. "Psalterz rymowany" Symeona Połockiego a "Psalterz Dawidów" Jana Kochanowskiego // *Slavia Orientalis*. – 1966. – No. 1. – P. 3–27.

demonstrated, in the layer of positive argumentation, a rich heritage of the Ruthenian Orthodox Church forming part of the Byzantine-Slavic tradition. The contemporary historian can only agree with the observations of Professor Łużny, who says that thanks to the work "Lithos" we have clear-cut characteristics of the Orthodox Church in the First Polish Republic <sup>1</sup>.

In the 1960s and 1970s there appeared many valuable publications written by the late lamented Professor Paulina Lewin (1922–2015), an outstanding scholar who made many new discoveries, by searching the relationships between Polish, Ukrainian and Belarusian culture, related to the development of Russian culture of the second half of the 17th century and in the 18th century <sup>2</sup>.

She demonstrated, using the examples of the works-interludes from school plays staged in the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, which were based on the Jesuit patterns, their spread and popularity in the Smolensk and Moscow regions and as far as Siberia. The contributions of Professor Paulina Lewin to the study of the problems of literary Baroque in Russia cannot be overestimated. It is thanks to the professors and alumni of the Academy that the Renaissance trends reached Russia through the intermediary of Baroque. The introduction of mythological plots into literature, and acquainting Russia with the literary output of ancient Greece and Rome, which had previously been unknown there, made a breakthrough which had a significant effect on the changes aimed at introducing reforms in Russia, and which, as is well known, was not initiated by Peter the Great but earlier under the rule of Aleksei Mikhailovich.

Paulina Lewin showed the routes for the spread of knowledge of many genres of religious and lay literature, works of ancient literature and of Polish and Western European literature in neo-Latin original versions and through Polish and Ukrainian intermediaries.

Polish researchers emphasized in their publications that in the development of culture in Russia in the 17th century, of great importance was the fact of the flow to Muscovy of the intellectual elite of Ukraine, which was absorbed by the former together with the partition of Ukraine by virtue of the treaty of Andrusovo in 1667 <sup>3</sup>. The ruling class of Russia could make an excellent use of skills and abilities of the "new" people. This may be indicated by the career paths of many figures from the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy circle, to mention only three authors: Symeon Połocki, Teofan Prokopovych or Stefan Jaworski.

<sup>1</sup> Łużny R. Metropolita Piotr Mohyla a "chamelentowie ruscy": Z nowych odczytań dawnej wschodniosłowiańskiej literatury religijno-polemicznej // Z dziejów Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej. Księga pamiątkowa ofiarowana prof. dr. hab. Władysławowi A. Serczykowi w 60 rocznicę Jego urodzin / Wyd. E. Dubas-Urwanowicz i in. – Białystok, 1995. – S. 195–203.

<sup>2</sup> Lewin P. Ukrainian Drama and Theater in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. – Edmonton – Toronto, 2008. Wykaz publikacji: P. XXXI–XXXIV; see also: *Chynczewska-Hennel T.* In Memoriam. Profesor Paulina Lewin (12.XI.1922–7.IV.2015) // *Studia Polsko-Ukraińskie*. T. 2. – Warszawa, 2015. – S. 205–209.

<sup>3</sup> *Chynczewska-Hennel T.* Z problematyki wpływów kultury polskiej na rosyjską w XVII wieku // *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*. – T. XXXV. – 1990. – S. 107–135.

Some years ago, Marzanna Kuczyńska described this flow of the Orthodox elites to Russia in the second half of the 17th century and in the early 18th century in the following words:

"The early Russian historians of culture and education were not afraid to say that the country owed them (Kievan scholars) the beginning of 'all that happened in the history of our science and literature.' But even if we depart from a pathetic tone, we must admit that it was hostage to grand policy, and it turned out to be an effective tool in the hands of Russian rulers leading their country from the mediaeval cultural-political formation to the modern one."<sup>1</sup>

The author of the article quoted above ends up her considerations by citing Łazar Baranovych's statement which has today, let us say, a very bitter significance: "May the envious people worry, but I can see that Russia is going forward. My opinion about Russians is such that the time will come when they will not need help from outside and they will even neglect it"<sup>2</sup>.

Meanwhile, the expression of firm opinions about the historical, religious and national consciousness of Ukraine a few decades ago was nearly a heroism in Poland. Of course, the works of Polish historians written at that time and relating to the problems linked up with the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy discussed largely the topics of Polish literature in Russia in the 17th and 18th centuries, the influence of Polish culture on Russian culture and their mutual cultural ties in later periods. As a matter of fact, the role of the Ukrainian "filter" and the specificity of the Russian Orthodox Church were discussed, but the focus was on the topic of the Eastern Slavic Baroque. This issue was raised at the 6th International Congress of Slavists held in Prague. Its post-conference materials include an important paper by Ryszard Łuźny devoted to Polish literature in Russia in the 17th and 18th centuries<sup>3</sup>.

Some attention was devoted to the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the "Historia Kościoła w Polsce", a multi-volume work published in 1974. The author of a fragment of the book concerning the history of the Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the years 1596–1696 Tadeusz Śliwa emphasized the importance of education in the history of the Eastern Orthodox Church. He pointed to the strength of theology; even though it was not taught systematically, many outstanding theologians lectured at the Academy, under the leadership of the Orthodox Metropolitan of Kiev Petro Mohyla<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Kuczyńska M. Odpyły prawosławnych elit z Rzeczypospolitej do Rosji w drugiej połowie XVII i na początku XVIII stulecia // 350-lecie Unii Hadziackiej (1658–2008) / Wyd. T. Chyn-czewska-Hennel, P. Kroll, M. Nagielski. – Warszawa, 2008. – S. 621.

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>3</sup> Łuźny R. Literatura polska w Rosji w wieku XVII i XVIII. Problematyka, stan i potrzeby badań // O wzajemnych powiązaniach literackich polsko-rosyjskich, tom poświęcony VI Międzynarodowemu Kongresowi Słowistów w Pradze / Wyd. S. Fiszman, K. Sierocka. – Wrocław, 1969. – S. 36–64.

<sup>4</sup> Śliwa T. Życie religijne i działalność kulturalna Cerkwi prawosławnej. Akademia Mohylańska // Historia Kościoła w Polsce. T. 1: Do roku 1764. Č. 2: Od r. 1506 / Wyd. B. Kumor, Z. Obertyński. – Poznań; Warszawa, 1974. – S. 320–323.

Although he wrote about a great role played by the Mohyla College and its open attitude towards Western culture, he did not ask one important question: Why was it only the Union of Hadiach that guaranteed the university status to the Mohyla Academy?

Certainly, one should mention a very good biographical entry for Petro Mohyla in the Polish Biographical Dictionary compiled by Halina Kowalska. The research work of the latter and that of the Ukrainian historians was referred to by Teresa Chynchewska-Hennel in her book dealing with the problems of Ukrainian national consciousness in the first half of the 17th century<sup>1</sup>.

Besides Konstanty Ostrogski and Petro Konashevych-Sahaidachnyi, an irrefutable role was played by Petro Mohyla, founder of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, named in honour of the first Metropolitan of Ukraine-Ruthenia after the reactivation of the Orthodox hierarchy by King Władysław IV.

The years 1990s brought an increased interest in Ukraine, including, of course, the interest in the Academy. These topics were slowly becoming "less dangerous and harmful," as some people had perceived them before. Such publications could finally appear without fear of censors' supervision. Thus, there appeared a series of the annuals "Warszawskie Zeszyty Ukrainoznawcze. Studia Ucrainica" edited by Stefan Kozak, Valentyna Sobol and Wasyl Nazaruk. The annuals were the aftermath of the international conferences of Ukrainists organized every year by the University of Warsaw. The topics relating to the Academy run through various volumes. Unfortunately, this valuable publication does not appear any longer.

Due to the initiative of Jerzy Kłoczowski and his Institute of Central and Eastern Europe, a Polish language version was printed of "Historia Ukrainy do końca XVIII wieku" written by Professor Natalia Yakovenko, which includes an interesting fragment relating to the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and, in general, to Mohyla's initiatives in many domains of his activity. It was thanks to the Ukrainian scholar that the Polish reader could have a reflection, if he did not do it earlier, whether Ukraine-Ruthenia was perhaps an unnecessary member of the Commonwealth of "Two Nations."<sup>2</sup> Eleven years later the author of her "Historia Ukrainy" slightly modified her first approach. The respective chapter of the book was then entitled "Ukraina-Ruś – «ten trzeci» w Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów"<sup>3</sup>.

The above-mentioned topics also run through the Polish-Ukrainian sketches which appeared as a result of the discussion on common national fortu-

<sup>1</sup> *Chynchewska-Hennel T.* Świadomość narodowa szlachty ukraińskiej i Kozaczyzny od schyłku XVI do połowy XVII w. – Warszawa, 1985. – S. 111 przyp.

<sup>2</sup> *Yakovenko N.* Historia Ukrainy do końca XVIII wieku / Tłum. O. Hnatiuk, K. Kotyńska. – Lublin, 2000. – S. 151.

<sup>3</sup> *Idem.* Historia Ukrainy do 1795 roku. – Warszawa, 2011. – S. 193; see also: *Яковенко Н.* «Про Україну можна без краю...»: зміни у сприйнятті польськими істориками минулого давньої України (1960-ті – 2000-ні рр.) // Український гуманітарний огляд. – Вип. 15. – К., 2010. – С. 79–103.



nes during the period of the Commonwealth of Two Nations, and, in actual fact, of “Three Nations,” and also of many other nations. These sketches were published by the Institute of Central and Eastern Europe <sup>1</sup>.

Jerzy Kłoczkowski wrote a preface to the Polish edition of the book written by another foreigner, French scholar Ambroise Jobert, and devoted to Poland's attitude towards the crisis of Christianity from the 16th to the mid-18th century. The first element of its title “calls” two figures of the Christian world that obviously influenced the nature of Christianity, since it says “Od Lutra do Mohyły” <sup>2</sup>.

The year 1996 saw the publication of many interesting works which were concerned with Mohylan topics. Rostislav Radyshevskij, the Ukrainian scholar and experienced specialist and translator of Polish literature published in Poland two valuable works in the Polish language. He prepared and wrote a preface to the printed edition of the manuscript of Jan Dalibog Vagilevich, one of the pioneers of the Ukrainian national revival and, besides Marian Shashkievych and Jakov Holovacki, the third representative of the “Ruthenian Trinity” <sup>3</sup>.

The work entitled “Pisarze polscy Rusini”, which was published by the Scientific Southeastern Institute of Ukrainian Studies in Przemyśl is worth mentioning, since this encyclopaedic guide, which remained in manuscript, unpublished until 1843, proved to be still topical and necessary. The works of Petro Mohyla and of his collaborators from the Academy circle occupy an important place in this publication. In the same year a monograph written by Radyshevskij was published; it was devoted to Ukrainian poetry in the Polish language from the late 16th century to the early 18th century <sup>4</sup>. Its author analyzed the works of the Early Baroque poetry and the links of Baroque poetry with the educational and religious reforms of Petro Mohyla. He emphasized the significance of ancient characters and plots as an important topos of the Ukrainian Baroque literature.

Following Natalia Pylypiuk's considerations, he also pointed to the role of panegyrics devoted to Mohyla and to the Polish literary tradition:

Bo jeślibyś chciał palmę widzieć w ruskim świecie,  
Znajdziesz Piotra Mohiłę w kijowskim powiecie <sup>5</sup>.

The author devoted much attention, among others, to Łazar Baranovych. His works related to the Polish literary tradition were characterized by Radyshevskij in the following way: namely, he wrote that the works of Baranovych

<sup>1</sup> Między sobą. Szkice historyczne polsko-ukraińskie / T. Chynczewska-Hennel, N. Yakovenko. – Lublin, 2000.

<sup>2</sup> Jobert A. Od Lutra do Mohyły. Polska wobec kryzysu chrześcijaństwa 1517–1648 / Tłum. E. Sękowski. – Warszawa, 1994.

<sup>3</sup> Jan Dalibóg Vagilevich. Pisarze polscy Rusini wraz z dodatkiem Pisarze łacińscy Rusini / Wyd. R. Radyszewskij. – Przemyśl, 1996.

<sup>4</sup> Radyszewskij R. Polskojęzyczna poezja ukraińska od końca XVI do początku XVIII wieku. Cz. I: Monografia. – Kraków, 1996; *Idem*. Cz. II: Roksolański Parnas. Antologia. – Kraków, 1998.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibidem*. – S. 128.

revealed characteristic features of a mature Ukrainian Baroque. Many artists, poets and engravers were grouped around this Archbishop of Chernikhov. The long-lasting silence about this figure, but also about many other persons from the Mohyla Academy circle, was due to the fact, as the author rightly pointed out, that Ukrainian literature disregarded them because they wrote in the Polish language <sup>1</sup>.

Today, there is a considerable interest in the works of the poets of the Ukrainian Baroque, and more and more researchers take interest in the poetry of Łazar Baranovych <sup>2</sup>.

The year 1996 also saw the publication of the anthology of Ukrainian poetry written by Włodzimierz Mokry which comprises poems written in honour of Mohyla and the Academy, as well as the poetry of its alumni, and later on its lecturers, including Sylvestr Kossov, Athanasij Kalnofojski and Łazar Baranovych <sup>3</sup>.

In the same year there appeared a Polish translation of the collection of essays written by Ihor Ševčenko (1922–2009) <sup>4</sup>. His excellent essay entitled “The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla” deserves much attention. Among its many interesting plots there is a discussion on the critique of the Academy and of Mohyla alone in the historiography. Russian theologian Georgij Florowski criticized very strongly “crypto-Romanism” and “pseudomorphosis of the Orthodox theology,” propagated, in his opinion, by the Metropolitan Mohyla in the Academy, which were supposed to be a greater threat than the Union of Brest itself. He maintained that Mohyla’s reforms were alien to Russian theology.

This “interesting issue of purity” of the Orthodox Church was also tackled by another scholar, namely Alexander Naumov, who wrote about Mohyla’s last work entitled “Требник” in a beautifully written book on faith and history. Mohyla’s *Требник*, which was a liturgical book, being a recapitulation of the entire liturgical tradition and of the Ruthenian Orthodox Church, as well as a testimony of the then reflections, is, in the opinion of this scholar, an attempt at a universal treatment of the Orthodox doctrine and a parallel of the reformatory steps of the Roman Catholic Church <sup>5</sup>.

The author of the present paper refers to the discussion on the “orthodoxy” of the Metropolitan Mohyla, who has been regarded for some time now as a saint by many Orthodox churches. A multitude of works published by an

<sup>1</sup> Ibidem. – S. 204.

<sup>2</sup> *Chynczewska-Hennel T.* Pojednanie polsko-ukraińskie w wierszach Łazarza Baranowicza // *Kultura staropolska – kultura europejska. Prace ofiarowane Januszowi Tazbirowi w siedemdziesiątą rocznicę urodzin.* – Warszawa, 1997. – S. 325–329.

<sup>3</sup> *Mokry W.* Od Hariona do Skoworody. Antologia poezji ukraińskiej XI–XVIII w. – Kraków, 1996.

<sup>4</sup> *Ševčenko I.* Różne oblicza świata Piotra Mohyły // *Ukraina między Wschodem a Zachodem. Eseje i Studia /* Wyd. J. Axer. – Warszawa, 1996. – S. 19–44.

<sup>5</sup> *Naumov A.* Wiara i historia. Z dziejów literatury cerkiewnosłowiańskiej na ziemiach polsko-litewskich. – Kraków, 1996. – S. 160–162.

entire pleiad of humanists studying the issues of the influence of Baroque on Muscovy – from Backvis and Angyal to the most recent works of Ukrainian, Russian, Belarusian, Italian and other historians – deny the negations of the Russian theologian Florowski <sup>1</sup>.

In yet another one of his books Alexander Naumov showed a great role of the Orthodox Church and the related cultural, educational and theological trends in the aspect not only of common heritage of the Commonwealth of many nations but also in a broader European dimension understood as the legacy of the Benedictine and Cyrillo-Methodian tradition <sup>2</sup>.

The same year saw the publication of the sermons and liturgical commentaries from *Требник* by Petro Mohyla, which were elaborated by Marek Melnyk and Włodzimierz Pilipowicz <sup>3</sup>.

The authors of the book emphasized, inter alia, the role of Petro Mohyla in the Orthodox-Catholic dialogue by starting their discussion with the first mentions of his participation in the Uniate-Orthodox conversations in the years 1627–1629 to the years 1644–1645, when the first Memorial was written by the Metropolitan <sup>4</sup>.

This project, *nota bene*, which was regarded as anonymous for a long time, is, beyond doubt, according to the findings of Atanazy G. Welyki (Athanasius, the Great), Mohyla's project. The Union proposed by Petro Mohyla was expected to be a "corrected" version of the Union of Brest. It is hardly possible to present more broadly the assumptions and the significance of this unusual project, which was described by Father Professor Waław Hryniewicz, one of the most prominent Polish scholars, a member of the International Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church, as the "Union without destruction" <sup>5</sup>.

Waław Hryniewicz, as well as other researchers whom he showed the way, drew our attention to the fact that Mohyla pointed to an erroneous understanding of the very concept of "union" on which the Union of Brest was based. Mohyla, who was a theologian, made a distinction between the concept of unification (union) and of the unity: *Unio et unitas sunt maxime diversa*.

<sup>1</sup> *Chynczewska-Hennel T.* Akademia Kijowsko-Mohylańska // Szkolnictwo prawosławne w Rzeczypospolitej / Wyd. A. Mironowicz i in. – Białystok, 2002. – S. 40–54.

<sup>2</sup> *Naumov A.* Domus Divisa. Studia nad literaturą ruską w I. Rzeczypospolitej. – Kraków, 2002. – S. 62.

<sup>3</sup> *Melnyk M., Pilipowicz W.* Kazania i komentarze sakramentalno-liturgiczne z *Trebnika* św. Piotra Mohyły. – Olsztyn, 2003.

<sup>4</sup> For more details on this topic see: *Melnyk M.* Spór o zbawienie. Zagadnienia soteriologiczne w świetle prawosławnych projektów unijnych powstałych w Rzeczypospolitej (koniec XVI – połowa XVII wieku). – Olsztyn, 2001. – S. 177–231.

<sup>5</sup> *Hryniewicz W.* OMI. "Unia bez zniszczenia". Memorial unijny metropolity Piotra Mohyły (1644–1645) // Studia Ekumeniczne. Vol. IX. – 1993, No. 1 (31). – S. 21–30; *Idem.* Przeszłość zostawić Bogu. Unia i uniatyzm w perspektywie ekumenicznej. – Opole, 1995; also an interesting work: *Stradomski J.* Spory o "wiarę grecką" w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej. – Kraków, 2003.



Marek Melnyk devoted his book published in 2005 to the writings of Petro Mohyla. In search of an anthropological approach to his works he focused on the main religious plots in which he included liturgical and sacramental, ecclesiological, ascetic, dogmatic as well as apologetic and polemical threads. The author showed Mohyla in an interesting and convincing way as a man of the Byzantine cultural space but also as a scientist who was able to draw from the Baroque post-Tridentine spirituality, as he put it <sup>1</sup>.

Of course, there are Mohylan topics in the historical synthesis all of which cannot be mentioned here. Let us confine ourselves to recalling the recently deceased Professor Władysław Andrzej Serczyk (1935–2004), the author of the “Historia Ukrainy”. Its first edition was published in 1979, and then, without censors’ intervention, the next editions appeared in 1990, 2001 and 2009. His books devoted to the Cossacks and Ukraine have been extremely popular in Poland.

One should also mention the works of Antoni Mironowicz, such as, for example, the history of the Orthodox Church in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth <sup>2</sup>.

It would also be right to mention the research work of Zoja Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew on the Cyrillic prints in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in the modern era. The author found a lot of interesting material which comprises dedications to Mohyla praising his enormous merits for the Orthodoxy and for the Commonwealth <sup>3</sup>.

Ruthenian homiletics of the 17th century in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was discussed in the work of the above-quoted author Marzanna Kuczyńska, who showed excellent examples of the work of Cyryl Stawrowiecki, the author of the “Євангелія Учительна”, and of Joannicjusz Galatowski and his “Ключ розуміння” – the evolution of the genre which, nota bene, was unknown in Muscovite Ruthenia <sup>4</sup>. Let us also mention another interesting work of this author devoted to the citizens of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth who were declared saints in Russia. Those were, inter alia, Saint Dymitr Rostowski (Данило Туптало), Saint Innocenty Irkucki (Іван Кульчицький), Saint Teodozy Czernihowski (Феодосій Углицький), Saint Joann Tobolski (Іван Максимович), Saint Filoteusz Tobolski (Філофей Лещинський) and others who were linked to the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy during the various periods of its activity <sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Melnyk M. Problematyka antropologiczna w pismach Piotra Mohyły. – Olsztyn, 2005.

<sup>2</sup> Mironowicz A. Kościół prawosławny w dziejach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej. – Białystok, 2001.

<sup>3</sup> Jaroszewicz-Pieresławcew Z. Druki cyrylickie z oficyn Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego w XVI–XVIII wieku. – Olsztyn, 2003. – S. 87–88, 93–94 passim.

<sup>4</sup> Kuczyńska M. Ruska homiletyka XVII wieku w Rzeczypospolitej. Ewolucja gatunku – specyfika funkcjonalna (Cyryl Stawrowiecki: Ewangelia pouczająca. Rachmanów 1619; Joannicjusz Galatowski: Klucz rozumienia. Kijow 1659). – Szczecin, 2004.

<sup>5</sup> Idem. Z Zachodu na Wschód. Obywatele Rzeczypospolitej na ołtarzach Cerkwi rosyjskiej. – Kraków, 2011.

In the review presented in this article we must also mention art historians, especially that the focus of the researchers all over the world has also been on the aspects of artistic activity and the problems of the patronage of the Metropolitan of Kiev. In Poland, the study of the Kiev artistic environment is conducted by Professor Waldemar Deluga <sup>1</sup>.

I have not mentioned many contributions made by Polish scientists to a large number of important publications in Polish, Ukrainian, and in other languages which appeared in many post-conference books, journals, collective works and encyclopaedias. On the other hand, Ukrainian scientists make contributions to Polish publications, which has been partly presented here. It may be a truism to say that science does not know boundaries and simple divisions. The best example may be the recent book written by Valentyna Sobol, who has been the Professor of the University of Warsaw for nearly two decades, published in the Ukrainian language by the University's Publishing House and entitled "Українське бароко. Тексти і контексти" <sup>2</sup>. The circle of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy runs through many pages and chapters of the book. Its comparative approach in the dimension of cultural anthropology of seeing the European Baroque enables us to understand more of the strivings of the Ukrainian elite at that time.

In conclusion, instead of giving a summary let me quote my article published in "Przegląd Humanistyczny" entitled "Academia Kijowsko-Mohylańska: historia i współczesność" <sup>3</sup>. It is dedicated to my Friends at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy: Professors Natalia Yakovenko, Yuri Mycyk and Vitali Shcherbak.

It was a great pleasure and honour for me to work for the Academy in the spring of 2002. In the summer semester of that academic year I lectured and conducted seminars for young people who were interested in the history of the First Polish Republic and Ukraine as well as their relations with the Holy See in the 16th and 17th centuries. There were endless discussions and questions also about the contemporary issues. Those young people with whom I worked, having an excellent knowledge of many European and non-European languages, fascinated equally by the past as well as by modern day problems, being very friendly and hospitable, open to Europe and the world, were wonderful continuators of the idea of the Academy at which they studied at that time.

<sup>1</sup> *Deluga W.* Malarstwo i grafika cerkiewna w dawnej Rzeczypospolitej. – Gdańsk, 2000; *Idem.* Grafika z kręgu Ławry Pieczarskiej i Akademii Kijowsko-Mohylańskiej w XVII i XVIII wieku. – Kraków, 2003.

<sup>2</sup> *Соболь В.* Українське бароко. Тексти і контексти. – Warszawa, 2015.

<sup>3</sup> *Chynczewska-Hennel T.* Akademia Kijowsko-Mohylańska: Historia i współczesność // *Przegląd Humanistyczny.* – T. 1. – 2006. – S. 59–68.