



Poland, the Ukraine and Russia in the 17th Century

Author(s): L. R. Lewitter

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Dec., 1948, Vol. 27, No. 68 (Dec., 1948), pp. 157-171

Published by: the Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4204006>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*

POLAND, THE UKRAINE AND RUSSIA IN THE 17th CENTURY*

En effet, que deviendraient l'histoire, la morale, la science mêmes, et les lettres, s'il les fallait vraiment allemandes, vraiment russes ou italiennes, vraiment espagnoles ou anglaises, aussitôt qu'on aurait franchi le Rhône, les montagnes ou la Manche ?

STENDHAL.

I

At the very beginning of the 17th century Muscovy experienced the most serious impact of the West on her national life since the beginning of her existence as an independent State. When, at the end of the Time of the Troubles (1598-1613), the Polish invaders finally retired, they left behind them a country ravaged by war, as yet only superficially united under the new dynasty and so weak that they might well have reckoned on a third and final return. Recent events had shown, just as the Crimean War showed over two hundred years later, that Russia, although geographically a European State, was not europeanised enough to be able to resist the military power of the West. With her rigid social system and her top-heavy patrimonial political organisation, her technical inferiority and intellectual backwardness, the much-vaunted Third Rome turned out to have been no more than an invention of the *starets* Philotheus. The Romanovs could survive as the ruling family—which was tantamount to Russia's survival as a State—only by abandoning, for the time being, the 16th-century notion of Russia's superiority and concentrating all their efforts on adopting the material attainments of the West to an extent that would at least restore the balance of power between Muscovy and her Western neighbour.

It was these political considerations that underlay the demand for Western wares, capital and skill which attracted to early 17th-century Russia the Western merchant, industrialist, craftsman and mercenary in large and ever-increasing numbers. For the time being they met with no hostility, and some of them were expressly welcome : in 1617, for instance, the merchants of Moscow agreed that strangers from the West wishing to set up factories in

* ED. NOTE.—This paper is the introduction to a study now in preparation of the academic drama in Russia and the Ukraine.

Russia should be given every help and encouragement. The attitude of the populace towards these “некрещенные немцы” (in Moscow every foreigner was a “немец” just as “фряжский” denoted not so much specifically “French” as generally “foreign”; only an Orthodox Russian was a Christian) was usually latently or overtly inimical and always suspicious. No Dutchman or German, Englishman or Scot was ever allowed inside a church. If he found his way in unnoticed, he was soon ushered out and the holy place he had defiled with his presence was swept and purified.¹

Russia's first *zapadniki* were to be found among the boyars, some of whom displayed pro-Western sympathies. The uncle of Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich, N.I. Romanov (?-1654), is said to have had a passion for German music and a weakness for German clothes; he owned an English lighter which could sail against the wind, as the future Peter the Great discovered when, in 1688, having unearthed it from a lumber-room, he launched it on the ponds of Izmailov.² There were others, too: Alexis Mikhailovich's tutor and the protector of foreign merchants and manufacturers B. I. Morozov (1590-1661); the tutor of the Tsarevich Alexis Alekseevich, the patron of Kievan learning F. M. Rtishchev³ (1626-1673), and the diplomat and administrator A. L. Ordin-Nashchokin (?-1680) who maintained that “. . . доброду не стыдно навикать и со стороны, . . . с примера сторонних чужих земель . . .” which did not prevent him from ending his life as a monk.⁴

Wise and useful men like these, who knew how to assimilate the good and to reject the harmful or unsuitable, gave the impression of having discovered the secret of selective westernisation. But there were others still, less fortunate, like Prince I. A. Khvorostinin, whose Western sympathies brought him only discontent, scepticism and deracination. In the course of his chequered career he served in turn the first Impostor and Mikhail Feodorovich, was exiled by both and fought with his own countrymen as well as against them. This courtier and warrior was also something of a poet, one of the first writers of pre-syllabic doggerel in Russia.⁵ He chose “вирши” as the medium for expressing his disgust with Moscow and his

¹ V. Klyuchevsky: *Zapadnoe vliyaniye v Rossii XVII v., Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii*, 1897, Books 36, 38, 39; Bk. 36, p. 142.

² *Russky Biografichesky Slovar'*, vol. Romanova-Ryasovskiy. St. Pet., 1918. Article on him by V. Korsakova.

³ R.B.S., *ibid.* Article on him by Korsakova.

⁴ Klyuchevsky, *op. cit.*, Bk. 36, p. 150. Also R.B.S. vol. Obezyaninov-Ochkin, St. Pet., 1905. Article on him by E. Likhach.

⁵ N. K. Gudzyi: *Istoria drevney russkoy literatury*, M., 1945. *Stikhotvorstvo v XVII veke. Dosillabicheskie virshi*, pp. 465-70.

inhabitants. "Все люд скучной, жити не с кем" he complains in his private notebooks two hundred years before Chatsky, "сеют землю рожью, а живут все ложью." He longed to sell his ancestral estates and settle in Lithuania. He read Polish books, criticised church-going and denied the Resurrection (probably under the influence of Socinianism, still rife in Poland at that time) and, accused of heresy, made his retraction in verse. He confirmed his change of heart by taking monastic vows in 1625, the year of his death.⁶

In the 'forties of the 17th century, circumstances compelled the rulers of Muscovy, lay and spiritual, to add to the material "good things" imported from abroad their indispensable complement, whose absence deprived them of meaning and lasting value, namely learning and, if possible, a brand of learning that would leave intact the country's spiritual tradition.

Here it must be recalled that Alexis Mikhailovich (1645-1676) and the Patriarchs of his reign were by no means the pioneers of Russian enlightenment and that, in the 15th and 16th century, Russia had received from the West not only guns but also, occasionally, ideas. In the reign of Ivan III (1463-1505) the cities of Novgorod and Moscow resounded with the critical and rationalist opinions of humanism, echoed by the Judaist heretics. Between 1516 and 1566, the learned monk from Mt. Athos, Maxim the Greek, a classical scholar, educated in Renaissance Italy, lived in Russia, engaged in making new translations of the liturgical books, correcting old ones and writing exegetical polemical and edifying works. His attempts at the vindication of learning, however, provoked the hostility of the authorities and more than half of his stay in Russia was spent in exile.⁷ None the less, already in the 16th century quite a few Muscovites were to be found who knew German and even some who knew Latin. Ivan the Terrible was the first ruler of Muscovy to contemplate the founding of a school where the two languages would be taught, Boris Godunov (1587-1598) intended to found several schools and staff them with teachers invited from the West. But the Moscow churchmen, convinced that the learning of foreign⁸ languages could only lead to trouble—"смыта в стране"—

⁶ S. F. Platonov: *Moskva i Zapad.*, Berlin, 1926, pp. 72-81.

⁷ M. Demkov: *Istoria russkoy pedagogii*, Pt. I, M., 1913, pp. 68-75, *Entsiklopedichesky Slovar* (published by Brockhaus & Efron), vol. XVIII, St. Pet., 1896, article on him by A. Gornfeld. The most recent work on Maxim Grek is: *Maxime le Grec et l'Occident*, by E. Denisov, Paris-Louvain, 1943.

⁸ I. A. Shlyapkin: *Sv. Dmitri Rostovsky i ego vremena* (1651-1709), St. Pet., 1891. *Zapiski istoriko-filologicheskogo fakul'teta imperatorskogo St. Pet. Univ.*, vol. XXIV, pp. 66, 67.

balked this scheme.⁹ Undaunted, Godunov decided that if the teachers could not come to the pupils, the pupils must go to the teachers. In 1602 thirty young Russians were sent abroad to learn French, German and English, but out of all these not one returned.¹⁰ One of them, Nikifor Alferovich Grigoriev, ended up as a parson of the episcopal church in Huntingdonshire, where he flourished until 1634 when the Puritans deposed him from his parish. . . .¹¹

Evidently, Muscovy and Western education were mutually incompatible, and no wonder, since the Muscovites neither valued nor trusted learning. For them, truth was to be found in revelation, not through inquiry, they were guided in their spiritual life by the beatitudes which said nothing of factual knowledge. "Не тот мудр," they believed, "кто грамоте умеет, а тот мудр, кто много добра творит." "Аще неучен словом но не разумом," writes the archpriest Avvakum, "неучен диалектике, риторике и философии, а разум Христов в себе имам. . . ." ¹²

This intellectual humility went even further ; in ancient Muscovy to call oneself a teacher would have been to display extreme presumption suggesting a sacrilegious attempt at usurping the divine prerogative to invest man with talents.¹³ Preaching "от себя" must have been similarly regarded since no sermons (as distinct from "поучительные послания") were heard in Russia between 1430 and the middle of the 17th century. Nor were there any schools before the end of that century ; what little education there was, was reserved for the clergy and cannot have been very effective if the Stoglavyi Sobor (1551) felt obliged to postulate the literacy of candidates for Holy Orders.¹⁴ In the 12th century the princes and boyars are reported to have declared : " Не наше дело книги читать, а чернецкое " ; their descendants (with notable exceptions) adhered to this view in the course of the four or five centuries that followed.¹⁵ The more fanatical enthusiasts of ignorance held that anyone reading a "learned" book exposed himself to the danger

⁹ Klyuchevsky, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

¹⁰ D. I. Ilovaysky : *Istoria Rossii*, M., 1890, vol. III, p. 363.

¹¹ Platonov, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

¹² Quoted from his *Life* by Klyuchevsky, *op. cit.*, Bk. 38, p. 553.

¹³ A. Pypin : *Poslednie vremena Moskovskoy Rusi*. *Kievskaya shkola*. *Vestnik Evropy*, 1894, vols. 169, 170. Vol. 169, p. 758.

¹⁴ P. Morozov : *Feofan Prokopovich kak pisatel'*. *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya*, 1880, pts. 207-11. Pt. 207, chap. I. *Stoglav*, ed. by D. E. Kozhanchikov, St. Pet., 1863, chaps. XXV, XXVI.

¹⁵ Quoted by Morozov, *op. cit.*, p. 420, from *Rukopisi g. Uvarova*, vol. II, section I, p. 71, M., also refers to *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, vol. I, nos. 184, 192, 194, etc. Cf. Solovyev, *Istoria Rossii*, M., 1857, vol. VII, p. 242.

of infection with heresy.¹⁶ Western learning, on account of its inordinate inquisitiveness and ungodly arrogance, the meek Muscovites particularly abhorred; as for Western theology, it was a major heresy incorporating all the minor ones: "Всех еретических вер сквернейши и лютейши суть латыняне, папезницы, понеже всех древних еллинских и жидовских и агарянских и еретических вер ереси проклятых в закон свой прияша, и со всеми с погаными языки, и с проклятыми со всеми же еретиками обще все действуют и мудрствуют," wrote the Patriarch Philaret in his "Соборное Изложение" (1620).¹⁷

Muscovite xenophobia found its strongest expression in relation to the Poles. Poland had been the easternmost bastion of Roman Catholicism for as long as she had been a national State; Russia had sucked in Orthodoxy together with Byzantium's malice against the West.¹⁸ It is therefore not surprising that as early as the 11th century to a pious monk of the Kiev Monastery of the Caves the devil should have appeared in the shape of a "Lyakh" ¹⁹ and that in the following centuries Russian draughtsmen should have invariably depicted him as clean-shaven and wearing Western clothes.²⁰ In the years immediately preceding the 17th century, Russia's apprehension of the West had been considerably heightened by the Union of Brest (1596) which, in matters of faith, subordinated the Ruthenians to the Holy See, and by the events of the Time of the Troubles in which the Poles had played so sinister a part. Clearly, as far as things of the mind and spirit were concerned, selective westernisation was out of the question. In this sphere the choice was restricted to the Orthodox world.

Time and time again since the end of the 16th century, the authorities of the Eastern Church had tried to impress upon the Muscovites how much true Christianity would benefit if a school and a printing house were established in Moscow, not omitting to describe what glory such participation in Orthodox defence against popish propaganda and aggression would reflect on Russia. But the reaction had been disappointing: the Russians had by now come

¹⁶ " Не читайте книг многих," говорили в древней России, и указывали на тех, кто ума изступил—а онсица во книги зашелся, а онсица в ересь впат." *Opisanie Rukopisey Rumyantsevskogo Muzeia*, p. 557, quoted p. 310, note 2, by N. Petrov: *O slovesnykh naukakh i literaturnykh zanyatiyakh v Kievskoy Akademii ot nochala ee do preobrazovaniya v 1819 g. Trudy Kievskoy Dukhovnoy Akademii*, July, 1866.

¹⁷ *Metropolitan Makaryi* (M. Bulgakov), *Istoria Russkoy Tserkvi*, vol. XI, St. Pet., 1882, pp. 23-25, p. 29 (note).

¹⁸ See Le P. Pierling: *La Russie et le Saint Siège. Études diplomatiques*. Vol. I, Paris, 1896, p. xiv. Also E. Golubinsky: *Istoria Russkoy Tserkvi*, M., 1901, vol. I, chap. III, pp. 589, 590.

¹⁹ *Pamyatniki russkoy literatury XII i XIII vekov izdannye V. Yakovlevym*, St. Pet., 1872, p. lxxvii.

²⁰ Morozov, *op. cit.*, p. 446, note 4.

to distrust the Second Rome almost as much as they detested the First and to regard their own country as the Third, final and solely authoritative Rome. If Western learning showed the cloven hoof, Hellenic wisdom (“еллинская мудрость”), cultivated in an atmosphere poisoned by the presence of the infidel overlord, was similarly untrustworthy. The fall of Constantinople in 1453 was regarded as a divine punishment meted out for Byzantium’s participation in the Union of Florence (1439). Besides, the Russians were far too busy with their own affairs.²¹

Muscovy’s imperative need of enlightenment brought about a change in this attitude; after all, Greek, as distinct from Latin, learning, although certainly not above suspicion, was by far the lesser evil. The belated response to the Byzantine suggestions came at last. In 1632 the Patriarch Philaret and his son the Tsar, approached the Patriarch of Constantinople asking him to send them a teacher who could organise and run what was to have been the first Moscow school. But there was no need for him to do so, as one Joseph, the Protosyngelos of the Patriarch of Alexandria, a most suitable candidate as he knew Slavonic, happened just then to arrive in Moscow. He accepted the invitation to stay and divide his time between teaching and translating, but it turned out that he was unable to divide it equally and whatever sporadic instruction his pupils received from him before his death in 1634 did not amount to much. Still Moscow had no teacher and no school.²²

What had been a tendency under Philaret became a trend under the Patriarch Joseph (1642–1652). A rapprochement with the Greeks and the recognition of their authority in Russian church affairs, the growing conviction that the liturgical books must be corrected by competent scholars, the consciousness resulting therefrom of the inadequacy of Russian education—these were the main features that characterised the period covered by his term of office.²³ Joseph committed the Church to a policy of reform²⁴ whose ultimate consequence, the schism under his successor Nikon (1652–1658), he could not possibly have foreseen. This he would have found more difficult, had he been alone in his desire for change and improvement and without the support of the Philotheists (“боголюбцы”), a

²¹ Klyuchevsky, *op. cit.*, Bk. 38, pp. 540, 541, 543; Bk. 39, p. 772; N. F. Kapterev: *Kharakter otnoshenii Rossii k pravoslavnomu Vostoku v XVI i XVII stoletiyakh*, 2nd ed., Sergiev Posad, 1914. Introduction, pp. 1–25; Chap. IX, section 3, pp. 383–426.

²² Kapterev, *op. cit.*, pp. 482, 483.

²³ Kapterev: *Patriarkh Nikon i ego protivniki v dele ispravlevniya tserkovnykh obryadov. Vremya patriarshestva Iosifa*, 2nd ed., Sergiev Posad, 1913, p. 2.

²⁴ Kapterev, *op. cit.*, p. 50.

group of able and energetic laymen and ecclesiastics who embarked on their reforming activities about 1640. Their programme was not only to counteract the effects but to uproot the very causes of all that to them, was evil in Russian life. They proposed to apply the distinction between right and wrong not only to the liturgical texts or the way of conducting a service but to the conduct of Russian men and women in every walk of life. Champions of virtue, they waged war against sin and vice.²⁵ Their concept of immorality, which was as wide as their ideal of Christian conduct was narrow, included every kind of public entertainment or merrymaking. There was nothing new or specifically Russian in this. The Christian Churches had been hostile to any lay miming and acting from the earliest time²⁶ as far as the end of the 17th century and even beyond. In France the Jansenist Nicole denounced the stage in his *Traité de la comédie* (1659), Bossuet anathematised actors and acting in 1694 (*Maximes et réflexions sur la comédie*);²⁷ in England theatrical performances virtually ceased with the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642, were strictly forbidden by the Puritans in 1647 and 1648, did not revive in secrecy till 1656 and officially till 1662.²⁸ In Russia where, as in the whole Christian East, there were no theatrical performances to prohibit and no actors to anathematize, the Philotheists attacked the Russian heir of the Greek and Byzantine mime—the *skomorokh*.²⁹

The *skomorokhi* owed their unpopularity with the ecclesiastical authorities to the prominent part which they appear to have played in the surviving pagan festivals. The Church fought them with all the means at its disposal and centuries of admonition, sometimes accompanied by repressive action on the part of the State, caused the popular mind to associate the *skomorokh's* tumbling, miming, music and dancing with diabolic temptation and the torments of hell. None of this, however, succeeded in making his performances any less attractive and he could always be sure of a large and

²⁵ Kapterev, *op. cit.*, chap. VI—*Kruzhok revnitateley blagochestiya*; Kapterev: *Patriarch Nikon i Tsar Alexey Mikhailovich*, Sergiev Posad, vol. 1—1909, vol. 2—1912. Vol. I, chap. I, pp. 1–30, chap. II, pp. 31–80. P. Pascal: *Avvakum et les débuts du raskol*, Paris, 1938, p. xix.

²⁶ See Allardyce Nicoll: *Masks, Mimes and Miracles*, London, 1931, chap. III—*The fate of the Mimes in the Dark Ages*; pp. 136–150—*The Church Councils and other records*.

²⁷ M. Barras: *The Stage Controversy in France from Corneille to Rousseau*, New York, 1933, Chap. IV, *Denunciation of the Stage by the Jansenists: Pascal and Nicole*, Chap. VII—*The quarrel of 1694*.

²⁸ *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. VIII, 11th ed., Cambridge, 1910. Article on *Drama* by A. W. Ward.

²⁹ For *Skomorokhi* see A. S. Famintsy: *Skomorokhi na Rusi*, St. Pet., 1889.

appreciative audience.³⁰ The virtuous and ascetic Philotheists believed that “песня и пляска от сатаны” and their actions demonstrated the truth of another popular adage: “поп скомороху не товарищ.” Between 1648 and 1651 the central authorities of Church and State, prompted by the Philotheists, sent out to bishops and provincial governors dozens of rigorist messages, worthy of the Lord’s Day Observance Society such as the “Память Верховурского Воеводы Рафа Всеволожского прикащику Иритекой слободы Григорью Барыну, о строгом наблюдении, чтоб служилые люди и крестьяне в воскресные и праздничные дни ходили в церковь, удалялись чародейств и пьянства и не заводили непристойных игрищ.”³¹

While it is true that Muscovy could only bring about her intellectual revival with the help of the Orthodox world, it must be remembered that within these limits she could still have recourse to the lore of Western Orthodoxy. Under Philaret (who had been a prisoner of the Poles) the existence of such a possibility would never have been admitted. In those days, the immigrant Ruthenian monks from over the Polish border (mostly from Kiev), contemptuously referred to as “обливанцы,” were not, in accordance with the decision of the Church Council of 1620, credited with Orthodoxy until they allowed themselves to be re-baptised.³² In 1627 and again in the following year, all “Lithuanian” books, printed or manuscript, were banned.³³ But already Philaret’s successor, Josaphat (1634–1640), neither doubted the Kievans’ Orthodoxy nor bore them malice and the next Patriarch, Joseph (1642–1652), made no secret of appreciating their learning. The “progressives” among the Philotheists, especially the future Patriarch Nikon (1652–1658), F. M. Rtishchev and Stephan Vonifatiev, were similarly

³⁰ V. Zhmakin: *Mitropolit Daniil i ego sochneniya*, M., 1882, pp. 556–59. For the critical attitude of Church and State in mediæval Russia towards this kind of pastime see: *Akty Istoricheskie*, vol. I, no. 125 (1578); *Dopolneniya k Aktam Ist.*, vol. I, no. 148 (1598); *Akty sobrannyye arkhheologicheskoy ekspeditsiy Akademii Nauk*, vol. I, no. 86 (1470); Domostroy, chaps. XI (here “игры бесовские” and “шахматы” are mentioned in the same breath) and XXXVI (“... скоморохи и их дело . . . будут . . . прокляти . . .”—quoted by Famintsy, p. 168); Varneke: *Istoria russkogo teatra XVII–XIX vv.*, 3rd ed., M.–L., 1939, pp. 9, 10. Cf. also *Nomokanon* (Kormchaya Kniga), art. 23a (A. Pavlov: *Nomokanon pri Bol'shom Trebnike*, M., 1897).

³¹ Cf. Famintsy, p. 167. “Бог дал попа, а чорт скомороха,” “скоморошья пореха—сатане в уреху.” Text of the “Pamyat’” in *Akty Istoricheskie for 1649*, no. 35. See also Klyuchevsky, *op. cit.*, Bk. 38, p. 537: at one point musical instruments were confiscated, taken outside Moscow in five carts and burnt.

³² I. Ogienko: *Ukrains'ka kultura*, Katerinoslav—Leipzig, 1923, pp. 29, 93. Karterev: *Patriarch Nikon i ego protivniki* . . . , p. 32, also chap. I: *Kharakter otosheniya k kievliyanam v kievskoy literature* . . . , pp. 3–22.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 7. See *infra*, p. 38.

disposed. These men had the young Tsar's ear, most of all Voniatiiev, who was Alexis Mikhailovich's confessor.

To these sympathies, as well as to the chronic inability of the Eastern Patriarchs to provide Moscow with a suitable teacher of Greek and Slavonic,³⁴ was due another remarkable feature of the decade 1642–1652: the intensified influence of Ruthenian learning. So much had it gained in strength that when Joseph began to insist on the absolute correctness of the printed liturgical texts and the native “книжные справщики” themselves came round to the view that a book, before going to the press, should be checked not only against the Slavonic manuscript but, above all, against the Greek original, admitting at the same time their own incompetence in the matter, in 1648 the Tsar himself stepped in and settled the matter by requesting the authorities of the Kiev Monastery of the Caves to send to Moscow the monk Damaskin Ptitsky. As this proved impracticable for the time being, he approached the Bratsky Monastery with an invitation addressed to Epiphanyi Slavnetsky and Arsenyi Satanovsky. They arrived in 1649 and Ptitsky followed one year later.³⁵ At last Moscow had three “справщики” who were Greek scholars and although none of them was a Greek, no one thought it necessary to immerse the aspersed newcomers.

When Nikon, on his election to the Patriarchate, extended this hospitality to Ruthenians who were not necessarily Greek scholars—particularly to choir-masters—and admitted Kievans³⁶ and even a Pole³⁷ to the membership of his personal staff (Avvakum bluntly called them “римского костела поляки и киевские униаты, блюдолизкы римские”),³⁸ their stock on Moscow rose sharply and remained high even after Nikon's deposition, attracting Ruthenian monks, learned and ignorant to Moscow and Muscovy by the dozen, especially after the “Union” of the Ukraine with Moscow in 1654. For Nikon was averse neither to Western ways nor to Western ideas. His library, according to a catalogue compiled in 1675, included two Polish and nine Latin books.³⁹ His headgear imitated a cardinal's

³⁴ Kapterev: *Kharakter otnoshenii . . .*, pp. 486, 487, 489, 490, 492, 493–97, 506.

³⁵ Kapterev: *Patriarch Nikon i Tsar' Alexey Mikhailovich*, Vol. I, pp. 47, 48. Kapterev . . . *Nikon i ego protivniki . . .*, vol. I, chap. IV, *O knizhnykh spravshchikakh pri Patr. Iosife . . .* Kharlampovich: *Malorossiiskoe vliyanie na velikoruskuyu tserkovnuyu zhizn'*, Vol. I, Kazan', 1916, pp. 126, 127, 131–33.

³⁶ Kharlampovich: *op. cit.*, pp. 251–54.

³⁷ Mikołaj Olszewski, see A. Jabłonowski: *Akademia Kijowsho-Mohilańska*, Kraków, 1899–1900, p. 263.

³⁸ Quoted by Shlyapkin, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

³⁹ Shlyapkin, *op. cit.*, pp. 64, 73. Cf. I. D. Belyaev: *Perepisnaya kniga domovoy kazny Patr. Nikona. Vremennik Imperatorskogo Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnostey Rossyiskikh*, vol. XV, II, pp. 1–134.

hat, his shoes were adorned with crosses, his mitre resembled a tiara or a crown, his crozier a caduceus, and he drove about Moscow in a quaint "малороссийская коляска." In a word, he looked more like the Muscovite idea of the Anti-Christ's uncle, the Pope, than an Orthodox Russian Patriarch. By behaving in this way, Nikon, who declared himself to be a Russian by birth but a Greek by his conviction and faith,⁴⁰ openly countenanced the new westernising tendencies. How did this self-contradiction come about?

The compelling necessity to adopt Western technics had inevitably created the need for enlightenment. But this was the province of the Church and the Church, logically but unwisely, proposed to begin at the beginning, that is to say not with education but by applying learning to a revision of the forms of worship. In this attempt to set the foundations in order, the whole edifice was split asunder. For Nikon had fallen into the trap that destiny had set for any reformer of his kind. First, he subordinated Russian tradition to Greek authority, next, in order to maintain this relation, he had to resort to the books and scholars of the Ukraine. All this was more than the conservative Muscovites could tolerate and instead of being blessed with enlightened perfection, Russia was cursed with the cleft of the *raskol*. As Prof. Pascal points out, the difference that divided Russia in 1653 was that between two conceptions of Christianity, one represented by Avvakum, the other by Nikon. The first was, so to speak, integralist, based on the belief that "man must subordinate everything to the work of salvation," the second—qualificatory: "A Dieu l'église, à nous les jouissances."⁴¹

The Church, until the end of the century, remained faithful, however fruitlessly, to the authority of the East which Nikon had set up anew, but the layman looked boldly in the direction in which Nikon had apprehensively squinted—towards Kiev and Poland.

With the aid of the Nikonian conception of Christianity, the average boyar soon succeeded in emancipating his personality and secularising his mode of life: even enjoyment—not to mention the quest of power for its own sake—was before long recognised as a legitimate end of human activity,⁴² and in the wake of secularisation, westernisation could proceed more or less unhindered.

In the meantime, a political event hastened this process. The war of 1654–1667 in which the Russian armies, trained and officered

⁴⁰ B. H. Sumner: *Survey of Russian History*, London, 1944, p. 190.

⁴¹ Pascal: *op. cit.*, p. xvi.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. xvii.

largely by foreign mercenaries,⁴³ succeeded in turning the tables on the Poles, ended in Russia's gaining Smolensk, Chernigov and the Eastern Ukraine, with the town and College of Kiev,⁴⁴ the easternmost bastion of Latin-Polish civilisation adapted to the needs of Ruthenian Orthodoxy. It was from here that flowed into Russia the first strong and sustained current of Western cultural influence.

II

Before about 1580 the plight of Orthodox learning in the Ukraine was little better than in Russia. The only Orthodox educational establishments were four monastery and five parish schools,⁴⁵ the clergy were ignorant, ecclesiastical literature was lacking. There was nothing to indicate the coming revival of learning and indeed when it came it was due not to any spontaneous internal regeneration but to the cultural flowering and expansion of Poland. In the West, the Reformation was brought about largely by the Renaissance, Poland and White Russia, on the contrary, owed their cultural revival principally to the Reformation, the Ukraine owed hers more especially to the counter-Reformation.

The reign of Sigismund Augustus (1548–1572) saw Protestantism in Poland at its high watermark. One-sixth of the nobility, including the majority of the best writers and the most powerful magnates in the land, abandoned Roman Catholicism for Lutheranism or Calvinism; by 1569 more than half the lay senators were Protestant; ⁴⁶ in 1573 the Confederation of Warsaw ensured freedom of conscience for the *szlachta* and Poland became for a while the most tolerant country in Europe—*paradisus hæreticorum*, attracting multifarious freethinkers in search of freedom and reformers in search of a following.⁴⁷

At the same time, rushing on from Poland and East Prussia, the new current swept over Lithuania and finally trickled into the Ukraine. In the long run, the effect of the Reformation on the religious life in White Russia and the Ukraine turned out to have

⁴³ V. Ya. Ulyanov: *Zapadnoe vliyanie v Moskovskom Gosudarstve*, XVI–XVII vv. "Moskva v ee proshlom i nastoyashchem," vyp. VI, p. 80.

⁴⁴ Treaty of Andruszowo. The clause stipulating the reversion of Kiev to Poland at the end of two years was never observed.

⁴⁵ Chelm (Kholm), Zimno and Zlatoverkhy Mikhailovsky monasteries; Turov, Kurenets nr. Vilna, Krasnostav, Zabludov, Vladimir. A. Martel: *La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes*, 1569–1667, Lille, 1938, p. 185.

⁴⁶ A. Brückner. *Dzieje kultury polskiej*, vol. 2, p. 127: "Teraz król do kościoła a większa połowica senatu i dworu, jako złe z trzewika, króla o drzwi kościelne otarszy, do swych borów albo zborów się rozbieżają' pisał wójt litewski Rotundus 1564r."

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 140 ff.

been superficial but its effect on the intellectual life of these areas was immensely stimulating and had highly important social implications. Firstly, Protestantism was perhaps the most important of the factors that led to the establishment of Polish as the literary language not only in Poland proper but also as the language of religious polemic in White Russia and the Ukraine. Secondly, when the wave of Protestantism began to subside as swiftly as it had welled up, those Ruthenian nobles who had embraced Lutheranism, Calvinism or, later and chiefly in the Ukraine, Socinianism, did not return to Orthodoxy but went over to Rome. These were the first signs of the rift which, by the middle of the 17th century, finally divided the Ruthenian nobility from the common people.⁴⁸

The counter-Reformation intensified and completed this process. The tolerant Sigismund Augustus died in 1572; in 1576 Stefan Batory, whom tradition credits with the utterance *Si non essem rex, Jesuita essem!*, ascended the Polish throne to be succeeded, in 1588, by Sigismund III who, in the same year, made the brilliant, fiery and fanatical Jesuit, Piotr Skarga, his court preacher. Poland was once more an outpost of militant Catholicism. About 1570 the Jesuit Order began to operate in White Russia and in the Ukraine,⁴⁹ rapidly ousting first the Calvinist, next the Socinian schools and replacing them with their own colleges.⁵⁰ Soon, the local nobility had only one choice: between sending their sons to a Jesuit College or nowhere. In practice they had no choice at all, for they could not afford to jeopardise their social status and weaken their political position by not giving them what was then regarded as the best possible education, no matter how much they may have resented the Jesuits' wily methods and alien spirit.

The Union of Brest (1596) added Polish-Lithuanian religious uniformity to the political unity achieved at Lublin in 1569, extending Papal authority to the very borders of Orthodox Muscovy. From Greek Catholicism to Roman Catholicism there was but a step; very often it was the doorstep of the Jesuit College.⁵¹ For in spite of repeated censure and interdiction from Rome⁵² the local

⁴⁸ A. Brückner. *Dzieje kultury polskiej*, vol. 2, pp. 366, 497, 498; Martel, *op. cit.*, pp. 216, 218. A. Savich: *Narisi z istorii kul'turnykh rukhiv na Ukraini*, Kiev, 1929, chap. I; *Reformatsyini rukhi v Bilorusi ta Ukraini v XVI-XVII vv.*

⁴⁹ S. Załęski: *Jezuici w Polsce*, Lwów, 1906, vol. I (1), p. 184. See also A. F. Pollard: *The Jesuits in Poland*, Oxford, 1892.

⁵⁰ Savich, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 67.

⁵¹ P. P. Pekarsky: *Predstaviteli Kievskoy uchenosti v polovine XVIIgo veka. Otechestvennye Zapiski*, 1862, nos. 2-4, No. 2, p. 563. Savich, *op. cit.*, chap. II: *Tak zvana katolits'ka Reaktsiya ta Ezuity v Bilorusi ta Ukraini*.

⁵² Martel, *op. cit.*, pp. 251-53.

Jesuits pursued their missionary aims with such zeal and success that by 1610 the monk Meletios Smotritsky (who eventually embraced the Union himself) had to complain bitterly in his "Lament of the Orthodox Church":

"Gdzie teraz nieoszacowany on kamuszek, iako Lampada lśniąca się Carbunculus, któregom to między innemi perłami, iako słońce między gwiazdami w koronie głowy mey nosiła, Dom Ostrożskich, który blaskiem światłości starożytney wiary swoiey przed innemi świecił. Gdzie y insze drogie y równie nieoszacowane teyże korony kamyki, zacne Ruskich książąt domy, nie cenione szafiry, y bezcenne diamenty, księżęta Słuscy, Zbarazcy, Wiśniewiecy, Sanguszkowie, Czartoryscy, . . . Puzynowie, y inne bez liczby, których po iedyńkiem wyliczać rzeczby długa była. Gdzie przy tych y drugie nie oszacowane moie klejnoty rodowite (mówię) sławne, wielkomyślne, silne y dawne po wszem świecie w dobrej sławie, po tężności y męstwie słynącego narodu Rosieyskiego, Domy; Chodkiewiczowie, Hlebowiczowie, . . . Sapiehowie . . . Pacowie . . . Tyszkiewiczowie . . . Korsakowie . . . y drugie. Nie wspominam tu szerokiey w Granicach Rosieyskiej Ziemie, Księstw y Powiatów, kosztownej oney szaty moiey, niepoliczonwmi perły, y różney farby kamykami upstrzoney, którą się ia ustawicznie zdoła. . . ." ⁵³

By the middle of the 17th century Roman Catholicism was established as the religion of the vast majority of the White Russian and Ukrainian nobility. This was not brought about by Jesuit intrigue or coercion on the part of the State but by the indisputable superiority of Polish over Ruthenian culture and by its indispensability to the *szlachta* of those regions as one of the attributes of the Republic's governing class, whether on the Vistula or on the Dnieper, where now to be civilised was to be polonised.

The most characteristic symptom of these profound changes wrought in the cultural orientation of White Russia and the Ukraine was what André Martel calls "the crisis of Church Slavonic" which occurred in those parts between the Union of Lublin (1569) and the Treaty of Andruszowo (1667) which marks the beginning of the decline of Polish cultural influence in the East.⁵⁴ At the outset of this period the position was described by an anonymous contemporary as follows:

⁵³ *Lament Cerkwie Sw.WSchođniey*, Wilno, 1610. Quoted by Martel, *op. cit.*, pp. 254, 255.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

Полска квітнет лациною
 Литва квітнет русчизною
 Вез той в Польше не пребудешь
 Вез сей в Литве блазен будешь.
 Вездзь же юж Русь иж тва хвала
 По всем свете юж дойзрала,
 Весели се ты, Русине,
 Тва слава нигды не згине.⁵⁵

In 1641 Peter Mohila writes: “. . . gdy mowisz :—że Ruś niema się po łacinie uczyć, ieno po Graecku, po Słowieńsku, y po Polsku,—na co odpowiadam :—iż Rusi słuszna rzecz dla nabożeństwa po Graecku y po Słowieńsku uczyć się, ale dla polityki nie dosyć ino na tym, ale trzeba im do Polszczyzny y po Łacinie umieć : w Koronie bowiem Polskiej Łacińskiego ięzyka niemal iako przyrodzonego zażywaią. . . .”⁵⁶ The Ruthenian nobleman who knew Latin could not have failed to learn Polish; in all probability he signed his name in Latin, not Cyrillic characters; he certainly read Polish secular literature which, incidentally, explains the absence of any remarkable native production in this field. The fact that the Orthodox Ruthenians chose to conduct their religious polemic against the Uniates mostly in Polish after 1605 and completely in Polish after 1625 must of course be regarded in the light of tactical considerations and testifies not to any lack of principle on their part but to the colonisation of their opponents.

But the nobility's eager acceptance of Polish culture and the Roman Catholic faith was by no means the rule for all the inhabitants of White Russia and the Ukraine. The peasants, on the whole, were hostile to the Union and clung stubbornly though inertly to Orthodoxy, but the middle classes which had no *aurea libertas* to gain from abandoning their religion and nationality, disturbed by the colonising effects of the Reformation, with the help of a few magnates and bishops, successfully resisted the onslaught with the cultural activities of their church confraternities (“церковные братства”). The origins of these organisations go back at least to the latter 15th century. At first they were often identical with some particular craft guild, later their membership became open to all Orthodox

⁵⁵ Quoted *Lament Cerkwie Sw. W Schođniey*, Wilno, 1610, p. 41.

⁵⁶ “*Лѣгос, albo kamień z prosy prawdy*” . . . *Arkhiv Yuzozapadnoy Rossii*, Pt. I, vol. IX, pp. 375, 376. Cf. *Akty odnosyashchiesya k istorii Yuzhnoy i Zapadnoy Rossii*, vol. 2, no. 158, pp. 188–90, “Речь Ивана Мелешка, каштеляна Смоленского, произнесенная на Варшавском сейме в присутствии Короля Сигизмунда Шго, против покровительствуемого Похльскими королями влияния Немцев и Поляков на обычаи и приемы жизни в Руси и Литве.” For all its comic character and lack of authenticity this speech is a valuable historical document.

townsmen and also to *szlachta*. Their functions, to begin with social, religious and professional, assumed a new and important character a century later when in many cases they won a considerable measure of financial and administrative control over the local churches. Towards the end of the 16th century and again in the early 17th century, some of the *bratstva* received from the Eastern Patriarchs the extensive privilege of *stauropigy*, exempting them from the jurisdiction of the local bishops, many of whom, owing to their Polish ways and Catholic sympathies, had lost the confidence of their flock. In 1592, Sigismund III displaying a tolerance more in keeping with the liberal tradition of the Republic than with his prejudices, confirmed the statute of the Lvov confraternity.⁵⁷ He also allowed its members to establish a *schola pro tractandibus liberalibus artibus* and to operate a printing press. This double distinction the *bratstvo* shared, partly or fully, with those of Vilno, Brest and Mohilev and later with those of Lutsk and Kiev.⁵⁸ These schools played a leading part in the defensive *Kulturkampf* of the Orthodox middle class which brought about the regeneration of Ruthenian national culture.⁵⁹

Although, before long, the character of the teaching in the "братские школы," in accordance with the prevailing fashion, changed from Helleno-Slavonic to Latin-Polish, they did not lose any of their essentially Orthodox character and most of the Ruthenian scientific, dogmatic and polemical literature of the period, so impressive in its bulk and quality, was produced within their walls. In 1615 the confraternity school was founded at the Kiev Bogoyavlensky Monastery.⁶⁰ It did not in any way differ from other schools of the same type and would no doubt have shared their destiny by sinking into decline in the 1630's had not the efforts of Peter Mohila determined its happier fate.

L. R. LEWITTER.

Cambridge.

(To be concluded)

⁵⁷ A. A. Papkov: *Bratstva*, Svyato-Troitska Sergieva Lavra, 1900, pp. xxviii, lvi, lxiv. Savich, *op. cit.*, chap. III, *Patronat i bratstva . . . bratski shkoli*; *passim*.

⁵⁸ Martel, *op. cit.*, p. 267. Savich, *op. cit.*, pp. 144, 150, 153, 155, 157, 164, 165, 170, 171.

⁵⁹ Savich, *op. cit.*, chap. III, chap. IV—*Kulturno-natsional'na borot'ba v Bilorusii ta Ukraini naprikintsi XVI i na pochatky XVII viku*. There were seven of these schools in White Russia and twelve in the Ukraine (not counting the Ostrog Academy, founded in 1580 by Prince Konstantin Konstantinovich (Vassilyi) Ostrogsky), as against nineteen and twelve Jesuit colleges. The Uniate and Piarist schools were less in number and importance. See Savich, *op. cit.*, chap. V—*Uniat's'ki biloruski ta ukrains'ki shkoli XVII-XVIII vv.*

⁶⁰ S. Golubev: *Istoria Kievskoy Duhhovnoy Akademii*, Vypusk I, Kiev, 1886, p. 97. Akademik M. Petrov: *Kiiv's'ka Akademia. Zapiski Istoriko-Filolog., Viddilu Ukr. Akad. Nauk*, Bk. I, Kiev, 1919.