

Saints and heroes: Ukrainian hagiographical narratives of the first half of the 17th century between Rome, Constantinople and Moscow

Nataliia Sinkevych

LUDWIG-MAXIMILIAN UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH

ORCID: 0000-0002-0301-3531

ABSTRACT

Saints and heroes: Ukrainian hagiographical narratives of the first half of the 17th century between Rome, Constantinople and Moscow

No other period in the history of the Kyiv Orthodox Metropolis gives rise to such contradictory opinions as to the history of the first half of the 17th century. The struggle to preserve the Orthodox identity after signing of the Union of Brest in 1596 and the need to represent the Orthodox way of salvation in anti-Catholic polemics sparked a keen interest in the idea of holiness and saints. This interest, however, did not trigger the canonization of contemporary figures, but rather a reminder of the former hagiographic and historical heritage.

KEY WORDS: Kyiv, the Orthodox Church, saints, hagiography, historiography, polemics

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Kijów, Cerkiew prawosławna, święci, hagiografia, historiografia, polemika

No other period of the history of the Kyiv Orthodox Metropolia causes such contradictory assessments as the history of the first half of the 17th century. The fight for the preservation of the Orthodox identity after the signing the Union of Brest in 1596, along with the necessity to represent the Orthodox way of salvation in anti-Catholic polemics evoked among Ukrainian Orthodox intellectuals the vivid interest towards the idea of sanctity and saints. It is notable however that this interest did not develop into canonization of contemporary figures, but into *reminding*¹ the reader the old hagiographical and historical heritage. But what kind of hagiographical cycles, figures and ideals were considered by Orthodox clergy of that time like *the own heritage*? How hagiographical stories were put in the general picture of historical past? Which methods and intellectual tricks were chosen by Kyiv literature while trying manoeuvring between actively promoted in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth Catholic ideas, traditional Byzantine roots and the growing impact of the Moscow Orthodoxy?² Today I will try to answer at least some of these questions, giving some examples from hagiographical texts, created by Kyiv Church intellectuals in the first half of the 17th century.

The starting point of the development of the 17th century Kyiv hagiographic tradition is the famous *Anfologion* composed before 1619 by the circle of Kyiv intellectuals:

1 The concept of reminding old historical past and developing in such way a new tradition was introduced by Y. Zatyliuk: *Mynule Rusi u kyiv's'kykh tvorakh XVII stolittia: teksty, avtory, chytachi*, dysertaciia kandydata istorychnykh nauk, Kyiiv 2013.

2 The problem was raised by scholars several times: I.L. Rudnytsky, *Ukraine between East and West* [in:] *Das östliche Mitteleuropa in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Wiesbaden 1966, pp. 163–169; I. Sevcenko, *Ukraine between East and West. Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century*, Edmonton–Toronto 1996, pp. 1–11; A. Kappeler, *Die Ukraine zwischen West und Ost. Überlegungen eines Historikers* [in:] *Sprache und Literatur der Ukraine zwischen Ost und West*, J. von Besters-Dilger, M. Moser, S. Simonek (Hrsg.), Bern–Berlin–Bruxelles 2000, pp. 9–15, etc.

3 *Sinopsis* [Kiev 1681], Facsimile mit einer Einleitung H. Rothe, Köln 1983, p. 12.

4 *Anfologion*, Kiev 1619, pp. 463–468, 1005–1017, 1017–1028, 1028–1034, 1034–1334.

5 I. Malyshevskii, *Skazanie o poseshchenii russkoi strany siatym apostolom Andreem*, «Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii» 1888, T. 2, № 6, p. 223; O. Nemenskiy, *Traktovki kreshchenija Rusi v polemicheskoi literature Zapadnoj Rusi pervoi poloviny XVII veka* [in:] *Ranneje srednevekovje glazami Pozdnego srednevekovja i Rannego Novogo vremeni*, Moskva 2006, pp. 57–61.

6 *Anfologion*..., p. 462.

7 O.V. Loseva, *Zhyttaa russkikh sviatykh v sostave russkikh prologov XII – pervoi treti XV vekov*, Moskva 2009, p. 336.

8 *Anfologion*..., p. 462.

9 Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoyi biblioteki Ukrayiny im. V. Vernads'kogo, ДА, П-556, folio 71 v.–74.

10 Z. Kopystenskii, *Palinodiia in Russkaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka*, vol. 4: *Pamiatniki polemicheskoi literatury v Zapadnoi Rusi*, part 1, Sankt-Peterburg 1878, col. 1161.

Elisei Pletenetsky, Zacharia Kopystenskii, Iov Boret-skyi and Pamvo Berinda. The work gained a significant popularity in Kyiv Church Metropolia and was reedited several times (only before 1651 four reeditions in L'viv³). Among traditional for *Minea* cults of liturgical year *Anfologion* included special services to Andrew the Apostle, Pechersk Fathers and at the end of the book – vitas of Prince Volodymyr, martyrs Boris and Gleb and Kyiv metropolitans Peter and Alexius⁴.

The cult of the Apostle Andrew was actively promoted in the 16th century in the Novgorod and Moscow writings. Significantly, the legend about St Andrew's preaching in Kyiv and Novgorod was turned in Moscow literature into a legend about the first baptism of Rus' by this apostle⁵. However, Kyiv *Anfologion* made the very different accents in its interpretation of the mission of the apostle: the mission of the Apostle is just an omen⁶, but not a baptizing. Instead of this Kyiv work actively uses the Apostle's image in Contra-catholic polemics: unlike in medieval vita of Apostle Andrew from *Prolog*⁷, a new version of the legend says that after his preaching in Rus' apostle didn't go to Rome, but returned to Thrace⁸. Later works of Kyiv authors (Lavrentij Zizaniia⁹ or Zacharia Kopystenskii¹⁰) deepened this ideological point emphasizing the seniority of the Apostle Andrew, who was considered as a founder of Constantinople Patriarchy, and his celibacy as opposed to the apostle Peter – the founder of the Apostolic See in Rome. By such comparison between the images of the apostles Peter and Andrew, Kyiv authors attack the core of Catholic ecclesiological argument about hierarchical superiority of St. Peter, the monarchical principle of the Church and the primacy of Rome towards Constantinople.

The textual comparison of vitas of Prince Volodymyr, martyrs Boris and Gleb and Kyiv metropolitans Peter and Alexius with popular in northern Russia *Chet'i-Minei* of Moscow Metropolitan Makarii shows unconditional textual connection. Even the engraving of *Anfologion*

follows iconographic canons, established in Moscow in the first half of the 17th century: the image with a cross, a sword, in a fur coat, which is decorated with rich ornamentation, and crenate crown. Such depiction, according to a research of A. Preobrazhenskii, just repeats the Russian sample¹¹.

A. Bulychev claims that services to Boris and Gleb, and the Kyiv metropolitans Peter and Alexius were placed in *Anfologion* because of pro-Moscow sympathies of Elisei Pletenetsky and his intention to distribute the book in Moscow¹². However, this statement cannot be proved because of the lack of comprehensive studies on the cult of saints in Ruthenian lands in the late Middle Ages. In any case, the cult of martyrs Boris and Gleb like the cult of his father Volodymyr in early modern time were deeply associated with the Kyiv sacral space. And despite the fact that Metropolitans Peter and Alexius stayed in Moscow, they were officially titled as Metropolitans of Kyiv and later were accepted even by Uniate hagiography¹³. So, the cults of saints Peter and Alexius were deeply rooted in Ukrainian hagiographical tradition of the first half of the 17th century; the best evidence of it is the depiction of both metropolitans in the altar part of St. Sophia cathedral in Kyiv¹⁴.

An illustrated Menologium by Pamvo Berynda composed of 1626–1629, which is stored in the collections of the Bodleian Library in Oxford, is a further interesting source in terms of the construction of the Kyiv hagiographic tradition¹⁵. According to the introductory inscription, Menologium was published in 1627 in Ukrainian town Kremenets (it might be the earliest of known prints of Kremenets brotherhood) and was dedicated to popular in Muscovite principedom cults: *Fasti Moscovitici rex imagines adumbrati per totum annum editi*. All saints are depicted in a very original manner that does not follow any known for me patters. Here, the separate commemorations of the death of Metropolitan Alexius (12 February), and the acquisition of his relics

¹¹ A.S. Preobrazhenskii, *Vladimir (Vasilii) Sviatoslavich* [in:] *Pravoslavnaiia encyklopediia*, vol. 8, Moskva 2004, pp. 690–718.

¹² A.A. Bulychev, *O posol'stve vlastei Kievo-Pecherskoi Lavry v Moskvu v 1619 g.* [in:] *Pravoslavie Ukrainy i Moskovskoi Rusi v XV–XVII vekakh: obshchee i razlichnoe*, Moskva 2012, p. 183.

¹³ Bibliotekos rankraščių skyrius Lietuvos mokslų akademijos Vrublevskių biblioteka, f. 9, № 684–686, k. 9, 48.

¹⁴ *The Travels of Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch: Written by his Attendant Archdeacon, Paul of Aleppo, in Arabic*, F.C. Belfour (transl.), vol. 1, London 1833, pp. 225–226.

¹⁵ B. Berezenko, *Tainopys Pamvo Berynda in Ukraïns'ka pysemnist' ta mova v manuskryptakh i drukarstvi* [in:] *Materialy 3-ii ta 4-ii naukovo-praktychnykh konferencii*, Kyiv 2014, pp. 98–102.

16 Bodlean library. Inc., Blockbooks, woodcut and metalcut single sheets, Russkaia pravoslavnaia tserkov' Arch. B b.4, fol. 4r., 6r, 9r.

17 A. Naumow, *Święci lokalni w myśli kijowskiej pierwszej połowy XVII wieku* [in:] *Ars Graeca – Ars Latina. Studia dedykowane Profesor Annie Różyckiej-Bryzek*, W. Bałus et al. (red.), Kraków 2001, p. 203.

18 Z. Kopystenskii, *op.cit.*, col. 841–846.

19 A.V. Sirenov, *Stepennaia kniga i russkaia istoricheskaia mysł XVI–XVIII vv.*, Moskva–Sankt-Peterburg 2010, pp. 56–59.

20 Z. Kopystenskii, *op.cit.*, col. 849–855.

21 S. Plokhii, *Nalyvaiikova vira: kozactvo ta religiia v ranniomodernii Ukraini*, Kyiiiv 2006, p. 27.

(May 20), Metropolitan Peter's acquisition of the relics (21 December) could be found as well¹⁶. Thus, I can assume that Pamvo Berynda was also influenced by the source of Moscow origin.

Zacharia Kopystenskii in his *Palinodia* (1617–1621) broadly uses images of Orthodox saints of several traditions: not only the Polish-Lithuanian, Novgorod and Moscow¹⁷, but also Balkan one. There we can find a number of Bulgarian saints, Serbian saints from the Nemanja's dynasty, in a kinship of whose Kopystenskii did not manage to deepen his knowledgesome Greek saints, the choice of those is still not fully clear. For example, in the list is Seraphim Dombutis from the monastery Hosios Lucas, who died shortly before the *Palinodia* had been written in 1612. Separately, there were mentioned the names of the saints of Mount Athos and Wallachian saints¹⁸. Interestingly, the Moscow intellectual tradition tended towards the same cults in the 16th century claiming the protecting of Moscow prince over the entire Orthodox world¹⁹. Moreover, the biggest amount of “imported” saints in *Palinodia* belongs directly to Moscow tradition²⁰. In fact, Kopystenskii constructed the common calendar of South and North Russian saints. Here it should be mentioned that according to Serhii Plokhii's observations, the process of confessionalisation had an impact on Eastern Christianity fundamentally different from the one that it caused in the West; as the result of struggle between different confessions in Eastern Europe the feeling of belonging to united Orthodox community – *Christianitas Orthodoxa* – has deepened²¹ and resulted in Kopystenskii's intention to create the as much as possible impressive image of Orthodoxy strengthened by the huge amount of saints' names.

These were the tendencies of Ukrainian hagiographical literature of 1620s. Concerning the hagiographical heritage of Petro Mohyla's Renaissance, my investigation is based on two important texts: the *Paterikon* of Sylvester Kossov (1635) and the *Teraturgima* of Athanasius

Kalnofoyski (1638). At first sight, these two works bring together a number of external and internal characteristics: they were both composed in the Kyiv-Caves monastery in 1630's, were devoted to the cult of the buried in Kyiv Crypts saints and both were written in the Middle-Polish language due to a wide Polish-speaking readership of Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. However, the ideological orientation of these texts like the intellectual background of both authors is completely different. Let's have a look at it.

Sylvester (Stefan) Kossov was born about 1607 in the Vitebsk region; he studied at several Jesuit colleges in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and in the Zamość academy²². Until 1635 Kossov was the rector of founded by Mohyla College in Kyiv, later he became the bishop of Mahilioŭ, Orsha and Mstislaŭ and the Kyiv Metropolitan (1647–1657). In his works, Kossov demonstrated himself as a consistent supporter of Catholic theology, namely its Jesuit school. His *Didascalía* (1637) was even sharply criticized by Moscow churchmen as incompatible with the teachings of the Orthodox church²³. Sylvester Kossov's political views were obviously pro-Polish. He took an active part in the Khmelnytsky negotiations in Warsaw, welcomed Hetman Janusz Radziwiłł to Kyiv and also refused the oath to Moscow governors²⁴.

The personality of Athanasius Kalnofoyski seems to be completely different. All the information we know about this person, is taken from *Teraturgima*. Kalnofoyski originated presumably from the petty gentry family Kanofoyky who was using the coat of arms *Sas*²⁵. I can assume that he decided to modify his name, adding to it the Greek word *καλός* (noble). A good knowledge of Greek (Kalnofoyski repeatedly uses the words of the Greek origin, and the title of the writing itself comes from the Greek *τερατουργός* – a miracle worker) allows us to suggest that he studied in one of the humanist intellectual centres. It is not known how Athanasius arrived to Kyiv. Obviously, this happened in the middle of

22 A. Mironowicz, *Sylwester Kossov. Biskup białoruski, metropolita kijowski*, Białystok 1999, p. 9; R. Łuźny, *Kossov (Kosów, Kossow) Sylwester* [in:] *Polski słownik biograficzny*, t. 14, Wrocław 1968–1969, p. 326.

23 R. Hotz, *Sakramente- im Wechsenspiel zwischen Ost und West*, Zürich–Köln 1979, p. 114.

24 S. Plokhii, *op.cit.*, pp. 318–320.

25 T. Liuta, *Sakral'na topografía Kyieva za Afanasiem Kalnofoiskym*, "Kyivska starovyna" 2005, № 5, p. 118.

26 A. Kalnofoyski, *Teraturgima lubo cuda, ktore byly tak w samym... Monastyru... Kiiowskim*, Kijow 1638, p. 79.

27 *Ibidem*, pp. 190–193.

28 *Ibidem*, p. 10.

29 V. Aleksandrovyč, *The Will and Testament of Afanasij Kal'nofojskij*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies" 1991, vol. XV, no. 3–4, p. 416.

the 1620s. The great attention in his work is paid to the already mentioned archimandrite Zacharia Kopystenskii, the metropolitan Job Boretskyi and other Kyiv hierarchs of pre-Mohyla time. Kalnofoyski certainly was personally acquainted with all of them. It should also be underlined that he represents himself as a mystic and an ascetic: in *Teraturgima*, the procedure of the expulsion of evil spirits is described in details. Moreover, Kalnofoyski underlines that thanks to his ascetic feats, he had received the power of performing miracles²⁶.

Significantly, Kalnofoyski set clearly in opposition to the Metropolitan Petro Mohyla. In one of the wonders, he describes the vision of the Pechersk monk Macarius, where the Mother of God predicts the future of the Pechersk monastery, and talks about a secular man, a stranger and a careerist who gives away the monastic estates. It is easy to recognise in this man the Metropolitan Petro Mohyla. The assessment of such behaviour by Kalnofoyski is clearly negative²⁷. It should also be noted that the *Teraturgima* was published without the traditional blessing from the Metropolitan Petro Mohyla on the title page. Moreover, Kalnofoyski compares himself to an ancient Greek sculptor Phidias who was unfair accused of insulting the deity by the Athenians. In one of the "parentheses" of his work, he also recalls the persecution of "us, Julios" by their own friends and quotes the letter of Apostle Paul (1 Cor. 9:26), where he protected himself from accusations of contemporaries²⁸. Probably, Kalnofoyski had faced the rejection of his personality by some part of Kyiv clergy. In the year of the publication of *Teraturgima* (1635), Kalnofoyski left Kyiv (he becomes an abbot of Vinnitsa), and we no longer get the information about him in the sources of Kyiv origin. The date of his death is also not known. Discovered by V. Aleksandrovyč copy of his testament, dated by 1646²⁹, is the last document that mentioned Kalnofoyski alive.

Whereas Kossov demonstrates his commitment to the theologians of the Counter-Reformation times,

Kalnofoyski stays in the intellectual mainstream of Middle-aged and Renaissance period. In his library, we can find ancient Greek authors, the works of Thomas Aquinas, John Kosterius, Cornelius de Lapide etc. Apart from the western authorities, he quoted and referred in his work to Eastern fathers: Sophronius of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, John of Damascus etc.

Now, based on the personal characteristics of our authors, we can look at the circle of saints, which they exalt in their writings. Both works are dedicated, first of all, to the cult of the saints of the Kyiv Caves. Sylvester Kossov's *Paterikon* was driven by idea to create a common hagiographic cycle for reading at home, in monastic cells, schools, during preparing sermons etc. The *vitae* part of the *Paterikon* is not original, but modification of the earlier text of the Second Cassian Redaction of *Kyivan Paterik* (1462). Kossov had several editor tasks. First of all, it is the construction of a certain pantheon of the Lavra saints. Kossov chooses only 35 of more than 100 saints, mentioned in *Paterik* text. The second result of Kossov's work is the adaptation of the old *Paterik* version to new rules of hagiographical writing. The variety of genres, which was one of the features of the Old Rus' literature, does not provide an easy fit to early-modern hagiography. Kossov recomposes the old *Paterik* material into separate *vitas*, tales and stories.

The aim of Kalnofoyski's work was practically the same: to spread the information and support the cult of the Kyiv Rus' saints by publishing their new miracles (the miracles were gathered and written down in the monastery from the 1620s onwards) and mapping the location of their relics. It should be noted, however, that the pantheon of saints of the Kyiv Caves in the works of two authors is different. In *Paterikon* we can find only those saints, who are clearly mentioned in old manuscript texts. However, here the ideal of sanctity, which was not accepted by Kossov himself, is omitted. For example, the wonders of St. Mark from the Caves, who was prescribing

30 S. Kossow, *Paterikon abo Zywoty SS. Oycow Pieczarskich*, Kijów 1635, p. 144.

31 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, Reiestr. Litera S.

dead people to move, seemed for Kossov unlikely, and most importantly – less of didactic miracle. Therefore, he omitted the vita of this saint, despite the fact that the cult of St. Mark was actively developing in Kyiv at the time. Generally, Kossov rarely mentions the relics themselves. For him relics are not the initial point of the cult. Moreover, sometimes the Paterik text contradicts the possibility of some saints' burial in the Kyiv Caves monastery. Kossov simply tries not to emphasize this fact. Writing about the martyrdom of St. John Kuksha³⁰ he ignores the information of his sources that the martyr was beheaded, because it would allow “rationalists” to verify the relics. Especially challenging for Sylvester Kossov was a problem of oil-oozing heads, that at the beginning of the 17th century were very broadly venerated, but not connected with any of known saints. The anonymity of the relics was a significant problem in the western early modern hagiography. The Catholic tradition had generally rejected the possibility of the canonization of unidentified relics. Kossov simply uses the rhetoric trick: “it is impossible to know all the names of the saints in the caves”; the main proof of the sanctity of these relics is the actual miracles³¹. There is only here, that Kossov made a substantial concession from the rules of the post-Trent hagiographic literature – a miracle is the reason for the recognition of the holiness, and not *vice versa*.

A completely different approach to the formation of the Kyiv pantheon is shown by Athanasius Kalnofoyski. For him, the decisive and fundamental is the existing monastic tradition of veneration of the relics. The number of saints, he puts in *Teraturgima*, is significant – he includes here all ever mentioned in Paterik saints. However, the number of relics in the caves was much bigger, so Kalnofoyski includes to his pantheon also the names, that never were mentioned in the written sources, but probably existed in oral monastic tradition. At the same time, Kalnofoyski had not a bother with the absence of didactic motives in some of the miracles. He tells in

details the story of the holy Onesiphorus³², who after death moved in his tomb, making the place to Saint Spyridon, despite the total absence of any didactic motive in this miracle. Kalnofoyski was also not precise to the “letter” of the old Paterik text. He localizes on his map the relics of St. Eustratius, although Paterik said that the saint’s body was not found³³. It should be noted that not all designated by Kalnofoyski cults were accepted by the further monastery tradition and were included in the text of canon 1643³⁴, which is considered to be the final stage of Pechersk canonization.

Despite the fact that both of the analysed works are devoted to the cult of Kyiv Caves saints, the authors recognize the underdevelopment of their cults, lack of clear understanding by the pilgrims, whose relics they are worshipping³⁵. It was rather the “programmed” and not a real cult of Mohyla’s time. What others cults are displayed in both works?

Both authors recall the Kyiv mission of the Apostle Andrew. However, the image of the Apostle does not have some special features in their works, and does not include the impact of Moscow’s narratives. Kossov along with preaching of the Apostle Andrew mentions the apostle Paul’s and his disciple Andronicus’ missionary in Slavic lands³⁶. Kalnofoyski takes information about the apostle and his successor Constantinople patriarch Stachius from Kopystenskii³⁷, calls the apostle the first patron of the Kyiv-Pechersk monastery, but it was impossible to develop this theme further. And, of course, both authors consider the mission of the apostle not the baptism, but only its portent (or an attempt)³⁸.

In addition to the mission of the Apostle Andrew, Kossov puts into his narrative a brief history of the other stages of baptism, which, however, in contrast to the preceding narratives before Mohyla time, were significantly modified. Ending the story about the first stage, the author says that the reason for the failure of the baptism were pagan princes³⁹ (according to the

32 A. Kalnofoyski, *op.cit.*, p. 15.

33 D. Abramovyč, *Kyievo-Peczers’kyi Pateryk: vstup, tekst, prymitky*, Kyiiv 1930, pp. 108–109.

34 *Psaltyr’ s vossledovaniem*, Kiev 1643.

35 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, Praefacya; A. Kalnofoyski, *op.cit.*, pp. 127–129.

36 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, p. 11.

37 Z. Kopystenskii, *op.cit.*, col. 1161.

38 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, p. 11; A. Kalnofoyski, *op.cit.*, p. 52.

39 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, p. 11.

40 *Gustynskaia letopis'* [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey*, vol. 40, V. Kuchkin (ed.), Sankt-Peterburg 2003, pp. 39–40.

41 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, p. 13.

42 *Gustynskaia letopis'*..., p. 41.

43 L. Kreuzer, *Obrona jedności cerkiewnej*, Wilno 1617, fol. A–Av.

44 *Gustynskaia letopis'*..., pp. 42–43.

45 *The Travels of Macarius...*, p. 221.

version of Hustyn'skyi litopys – frequent wars⁴⁰). The information of Hustyn'skyi litopys about the baptizing of Bulgarian Prince Boris is omitted in the *Paterikon*; Moravian princes Svyatopolk, Rostislav and Kotsel, according to the version of Kossow⁴¹ (it also contradicts Hustyn'skyi litopys⁴²), had not been baptized, but only asked for baptism. The princes, who according to the version of the other narratives were contemporaries of the third stage (Askold and Dir⁴³, or Prince Oleg⁴⁴), were not mentioned in *Paterikon* at all. Ignoring the information of sources about the Slavic princes who were Christians before Volodymyr, and emphasizing the importance of converting the princes as a prerequisite for the successful baptism of the people, Sylvester Kossow points out the importance of the mission “of the great monarch of all Russia” Volodymyr. Thus, “Kyiv patriotism” of our author is clearly manifested there; first of all, he proclaims the cult of Prince Volodymyr. Acquiring the relics of St. Volodymyr, his glorification as a Baptist of Russia, a patron of education and the Church, the attitude towards the saint as a personal patron of the Metropolitan Mohyla – all this makes the figure of St. Volodymyr extremely important for the *Paterikon*.

However, the cult of others Rurikids is not developed in *Paterikon*. Even Princess Olga is not named as a saint and is not glorified in the text. For a long time in Kyiv, the one who along with Volodymyr was considered a saint-baptizer, was not Princess Olga, but Volodymyr's wife Byzantine Princess Anne; it is about the veneration of Anne instead of Olga recalls in his diary Paul of Aleppo after his visiting Kyiv⁴⁵. Kossow writes about martyrs Boris and Gleb, but they appear in the *Paterikon* only in connection with the cult of Prince Volodymyr, and are not subjects of special attention of the author. Kossow does not rely on the existing medieval Russian sources, but only retells all the information about the martyrs placed into the Chronicle of Matthew Strykowski. In fact, he only retells the legend of the transfer of the

Volodymyr's relics to Vyshgorod⁴⁶, but this episode has a purely didactic role and is included into the work in connection with the anti-Protestant controversy carried out in *Paterikon*. The main laic hero Adam Kysil, whom *Paterikon* is dedicated to, also doesn't belong to Rurikids but leads his genealogical legend from "aborigine of Kyiv lands" St. Volodymyr's boyar Sventold⁴⁷.

Much more attention to the saints of the dynasty of the Rurikids is paid by Kalnofoyski. He pays an equal attention to Princess Olga, Prince Volodymyr, Boris and Gleb⁴⁸. Interestingly, the chronology of the life of Olga (the duration of her life and date of death) is taken by Kalnofoyski not from Hustyn'skyi or Ipatiev Chronicles, but from *Stepennaia Kniga*⁴⁹ or a derivative narrative. There it should be emphasized that the veneration of Princess Olga first actively developed in the Pskov traditions and had a special meaning for Moscow scribes by the middle of the 16th century: the princess was seen as a direct ancestor of Ivan the Terrible⁵⁰. It is from there it got into Kyiv works. An eloquent example of this is the fact that the Princess Olga in *Palinodia* Zacharia Kopystenskii called "Moskovka and pskovianka"⁵¹.

A special place in the work of Kalnofoyski takes the cult of martyrs Boris and Gleb. For Kalnofoyski, the connection of Boris and Gleb's cult with Moscow is obvious; he even informs the reader that the martyrs' relics were taken to Moscow, that "always honored saints of God"⁵².

In a separate addition of "special patrons" of the Caves Monastery, Kalnofoyski gives a long list of names of Rurik's dynasty⁵³. They are Prince Iaroslav, Princess Anna, then follow the heroes of the Paterik story Prince Sviatoslav, Iziaslav and Vsevolod Iaroslaviches. Another patron is "the great prince" Vsevolod Georgievich (Dmitry Vladimirsky), who was not connected with Kyiv, but was praised in *Stepennaia Kniga*⁵⁴. He is followed by his brother Andrew Bogoliubskii who appeared to the monastic tradition as a major benefactor of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra despite his devastating raid

46 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, pp. 171–172.

47 F.E. Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653*, Cambridge, MA 1985, p. 96.

48 A. Kalnofoyski, *op.cit.*, pp. 53–54.

49 *Kniga Stepennaia carskogo rodosloviiia* [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey*, vol. 21, part 1, Sankt-Peterburg 1907, p. 24.

50 A.V. Sirenov, *op.cit.*, p. 74.

51 Z. Kopystenskii, *op.cit.*, col. 125.

52 A. Kalnofoyski, *op.cit.*, pp. 102–104.

53 *Ibidem*, pp. 55–59.

54 *Kniga Stepennaia...*, pp. 221–229.

55 I. Zatyliuk, *Gramota Andriia Boholiubs'kogo Kyievo-Pechers'komu monastyriu*, "Ruthenica" 2008, vol. VII, pp. 215–235.

56 *Kniga Stepennaia*..., pp. 230–235.

57 A. Kalnofoyski, *op.cit.*, *Przedmowa*.

58 *Kniga Stepennaia*..., pp. 267–277.

59 L. Voitovych, *Kniazha doba: portrety elity*, Bila Cerkva 2006, p. 62.

on Kyiv in 1169⁵⁵. Thus, I assume the influence on Kalnofoyski of the Moscow tradition that glorifies God-loving Prince Andrew as a martyr⁵⁶.

Further in Kalnofoyski's list, is mentioned Volodymyr Monomakh. He conveys in details the legend of the crown of Monomakh, and stresses that Moscow monarchs are still crowned by this very crown⁵⁷. Two following Princes are directly connected with the Kyiv tradition and are glorified by Kalnofoyski in its context: Svyatopolk as the founder of the monastery of St. Michael and Vsevolod Svyatoslavich as a husband of the founder of the St. Cyril Monastery in Kyiv. Remarkably, Michael of Chernigov and his boyar Fedor are also glorified. The history of the martyrdom of Michael of Chernigov and his boyar, who were killed by Batu Khan and whose relics were taken to Moscow in 1570s, is to be found already in the *Stepennaia Kniga*⁵⁸. The next Princes are Mstislav Monomakh and Eustace Fedorovich – the direct ancestors of Svyatopolk – Chetvertinsky princes. The Prince Stanislaw, according to the L. Voytovych's version is a legendary Prince who is mentioned in the Belarusian-Lithuanian chronicles (and after them Strykovsky) in connection with the campaign of Prince Gediminas to Kyiv in 1321, and who was considered a direct ancestor of Ostrog princes⁵⁹. The biggest surprise here is the mention of great Kyiv prince Ivan IV at the end of Kalnofoyski's list. Obviously, it was important for Kalnofoyski to close the list of donators with the latest Rurikids on the Moscow throne.

Therefore, it is noticeable in *Teraturgima* the consistent veneration of Rurikids cults dates back to Moscow historiographical and hagiographical traditions. Only in some cases, Kalnofoyski emphasizes their relation to the Lavra or Principality of Kyiv. Mostly, there is an impression of a mechanical copying of their names from one narrative of the Moscow origin. It doesn't mean, however, that Kalnofoyski avoided to portrait "Roxalanian" nobles. The list of donators is continuing by the representatives of Ruthenian princes and szlachta, whose military merits

surprised “arrogant Moscovites”⁶⁰. And, despite of his sympathy to Ivan the Terrible, Kalnofoyski showed the political patriotisms of his heroes including in his work the story about Jakob Chetvertinsky’s resignation of Moscow tsar’s generosity in Moscow in 1580⁶¹.

Now I turn to the problem of the glorification of Kyiv Metropolitans. Arguing on the Kyiv Church’s dependence on Constantinople, Uniate and Orthodox authors of Kyiv Metropolia created several lists of Kyiv bishops with brief characteristics of the metropolitans. This list is contained in the works of Leo Kreuza⁶², Zacharia Kopystenskii⁶³ and in *Paterikon*⁶⁴. No doubt in the preparation of this list, all three authors used the sources of Moscow origin. The list of Kossov directly follows the *Stepennaia kniga*. Russian chronicles, not Strykovsky Chronicle as in the rest of the work, are here a fundamental source for Kossov. This is particularly evident in the cult of the first Kyiv Metropolitan Michael. This Metropolitan often appears in Moscow texts and is a polemical significant figure (seen as a protégé of the patriarch of Constantinople Photios⁶⁵). While in previous versions of the story of the Rus baptism hierarch Michael appears twice (during the time of the baptism of princes Askold and Dir and as a contemporary of Volodymyr’s baptism⁶⁶), *Paterikon* fundamentally rejects the version of the expulsion of Metropolitan Michael to Russia in 886 (he emphasizes that chronicles do not indicate the name of those times hierarch). Writing about the presence of imperishable body of the first Russian metropolitan in Anthony’s Caves, Kossov adds, “but was taken from Constantinople by Vladimir, in 1000”⁶⁷. Strykovsky calls the first hierarch of Kyiv some Facii⁶⁸, but this information is denied by Kossov⁶⁹ – this is one of the few places where he takes issue with the Polish chronicler. It is obvious that the cult of the Metropolitan Michael, along with the cult of St. Vladimir was one of the “programmatic” for Mohyla time and Kossov does everything possible for its development.

60 A. Kalnofoyski, *op.cit.*, p. 43.

61 *Ibidem*, *Przedmowa*.

62 L. Kreuza, *op.cit.*, pp. 55–66.

63 Z. Kopystenskii, *op.cit.*, col. 1005–1049.

64 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, pp. 169–181.

65 *Kniga Stepennaia*..., pp. 102, 109, 113.

66 *Gustynskaia letopis'*..., pp. 39–44.

67 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, p. 170.

68 M. Strykowski, *Kronika polska, litewska, żmudzka i wszyskiej Rusi*, Królewiec 1582, p. 141.

69 S. Kossow, *op.cit.*, p. 15.

70 *Ibidem*, p. 180.

71 *Ibidem*, p. 177.

72 *Kniga Stepennaia...*, pp. 40–53.

73 Spasskii Sergii, *Polnyi mesiaceslov Vostoka*, t. II, Moskva 1876, pp. 136, 189.

In his list of Kyiv Metropolitans, Kossov did not mention the Moscow hierarchs. His main idea here is following – the Orthodox Church in Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth has to find a *modus vivendi* between the Catholic Warsaw and captured but very important for Kyiv Constantinople. That's why Kossov constantly stresses the historical examples Kyiv hierarchs' obedience to both sides. Even the metropolitan Iov Boretskyi, who was the head of illegal in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth hierarchy, is described in *Paterikon* as creature of Polish king Sigismund III⁷⁰.

Kalnofoyski among the saints mentions Kyiv Metropolitans, who stayed in Moscow: Alexius, miracle-workers Peter, Cyprian, Photius and Jonah and also some Constantinople Patriarchs: Nicholaus, Sergios and Michael. At the same time Metropolitans Cyprian and Jonah are not mentioned in the *Paterikon* as saints and Metropolitan Photios is mentioned in a very negative way – Kossov reminds to the reader that this Metropolitan took away the treasures from Kyiv Sofia cathedral⁷¹. It is clear that Kalnofoyski, referring to these metropolitans as saints, is completely under the influence of the Moscow spiritual tradition, which in the 16th century began to glorify metropolitans Photius, Jonah, and Cyprian⁷².

In the case of the Constantinople patriarchs, Sergios I and Nicholas II were obviously selected by Kalnofojsky because they were contemporaries to the baptism of Rus. Prince Volodymyr was baptized at the time of Sergios I and Nicholas II. In the case of patriarch Michael Cerularius, he was mentioned by Kalnofoyski like a saint due to his significant role in Catholic-Orthodox relations – in the time of this patriarch had happened a mutual Anathema of the Roman and Byzantine churches. It is significant that in the official Orthodox Church calendar there are placed only Patriarchs Nicholas Chrysoberges and Sergios I⁷³, while Michael was included in the list of saints by Kalnofoyski himself because of his leading role in the Latin-Greek polemics.

In general, we want to emphasize that the pantheon of saints in both works (*Paterikon* and *Teraturgima*) was directly influenced by the origin, cultural and educational orientation of their authors. Educated in Vilnius Jesuit college Sylvester Kossov was a disciple of the Western spiritual culture, and that's why the miraculous image of Christ for him is associated with the shawl of Veronica, but not with the mentioned in old Paterik texts and popular in the Eastern Christianity image, given by Christ to the king Abgar⁷⁴. Moscow is of little interest for Kossov, he mentions it mainly in connection with the retelling of some historical events and basing on Strykovsky's Chronicle.

A completely different situation is with Athanasius Kalnofoyski and his *Teraturgima*, where the Moscow trace is very noticeable. All the information about Moscow is highlighted in the *Teraturgima*. Moreover, this image is very positive. Here is one more example. Parallel fixation of miracles in the Kyiv-Pechersk monastery was also conducted by Metropolitan Petro Mohyla; the factual material and a selection of wonders in the two works differ. In the context of this article, it is important thing is that Kalnofoyski misses in his narration transmitted by Mohyla story about the Moscow monk Theodosius, who was punished for eating meat in Lavra⁷⁵. Instead, he gives a "positive" example – the miracle of Martin from Moscow, who was healed in Kyiv caves, served a prayer service and then happily returned to Moscow in 1634. The ideal image of Moscow is supplemented here by the remark that there can not be found another monastery rules, but the "rules of St. Basil the Great"⁷⁶. It is also noteworthy that Kalnofoyski devotes a separate section on the issue of rumors about Kyiv caves' spread to Moscow⁷⁷. He regrets that he has no information on the Pskov-Pechersk monastery (the only source for him is the chronicle of Alexander Guagnini) and cannot by himself "decorate Sparta" (Moscow), so he leaves this to Muscovites. "And one who studies other people's affairs

74 S. Kossov, *op.cit.*, pp. 936, 176–177.

75 *Zapysky sviatyelia Petra Mohyly, uporiadkuvannia I.V. Zhylenko*, Kyiv 2011, p. 101.

76 A. Kalnofoyski, *op.cit.*, p. 59.

77 *Ibidem*, pp. 67–69.

badly, that one damages his ones” – that is how Kalnofoyski sums up his retreat to the Moscow history. Thus, Kalnofoyski’s Moscow is uniquely “alien” and unfamiliar, but an ideal kingdom in which Orthodoxy has preserved the purity of its tradition.

Therefore, I was aiming to prove the existence of two mainstreams in Kyiv spiritual literature: one related to the immediate environment of the metropolitan Peter Mohyla and represented in our case by Sylvester Kossov, who tries to reconstruct (or mainly construct) the “primary” Kyiv tradition with the prevailing cult of Prince Volodymyr the Baptist, first hierarch Michael and saints of the Kyiv-Caves Paterik. The other mainstream, taking its origin from the tradition of 1620s and represented by Athanasius Kalnofoyski, is based on the popular in Pechersk Lavra cult of relics and mysticism, tends towards a common spiritual tradition of *Christianitas Orthodoxa* and actively uses the cults and heroes of Moscow Orthodoxy.

BILIBIOGRAPHY

- Abramovyč D., *Kyievo-Peczers'kyi Paterky: vstup, tekst, prymitky*, Kyiiv 1930.
- Aleksandrovyč V., *The Will and Testament of Afanasij Kal'nofojskyj*, «Harvard Ukrainian Studies» 1991, vol. XV, no. 3–4, pp. 415–428.
- Anfologion*, Kiev 1619.
- Bibliotekos rankraščių skyrius Lietuvos mokslų akademijos Vrublevskių biblioteka, f. 9, № 684–686.
- Berezenko B., *Tainopys Pamvo Beryndy in Ukrainis'ka pysemnist' ta mova v manuskryptakh I drukarstvi* [in:] *Materialy 3-ii ta 4-ii naukovo-praktychnykh konferencii*, Kyiiv 2014, pp. 98–102.
- Bodleian Libriry. Inc., Blockbooks, woodcut and metalcut single sheets, Russkaia pravoslavnaia tserkov' Arch. B b.4.
- Bulychev A.A., *O posol'stve vlastei Kievo-Pecherskoi Lavry v Moskvu v 1619 g.* [in:] *Pravoslavie Ukrainy i Moskovskoi Rusi v XV–XVII vekakh: obshchee i razlichnoe*, Moskva 2012.
- Gustynskaia letopis'* [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey*, vol. 40, V. Kuchkin (ed.), Sankt-Peterburg 2003.
- Hotz R., *Sakramente- im Wechsenspiel zwischen Ost und West*, Zürich–Köln 1979.
- Institut rukopysu Natsionalnoyi biblioteky Ukrayiny im. V. Vernads'kogo, ДА, П-556.
- Kalnofoyski A., *Teraturgima lubo cuda, ktore byly tak w samym... Monastyru... Ktiowskim*, Kijow 1638.
- Kappeler A., *Die Ukraine zwischen West und Ost. Überlegungen eines Historikers* [in:] *Sprache und Literatur der Ukraine zwischen Ost und West*, J. von Besters-Dilger, M. Moser, S. Simonek (Hrsg.), Berlin–Berlin–Bruxelles 2000, pp. 9–15.
- Kniga Stepennaia carskogo rodosloviia* [in:] *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisey*, vol. 21, part 1, Sankt-Peterburg 1907.
- Kopystenskii Z., *Palinodiia in Russkaia Istoricheskaia Biblioteka*, vol. 4: *Pamiatniki polemiceskoi literatury v Zapadnoi Rusi*, part 1, Sankt-Peterburg 1878.
- Kossow S., *Paterikon abo Zywooty SS. Oycow Pieczarskich*, Kijów 1635.
- Kreuz L., *Obrona iedności cerkiewnej*, Wilno 1617.
- Letopis' po Ipatskomu spisku*, Sankt-Peterburg 1871.
- Liuta T., *Sakral'na topografia Kyieva za Afanasiiem Kalnofoiskym*, “Kyivska starovyna” 2005, № 5, pp. 117–128.
- Loseva O.V., *Zhytitiia russkikh sviatykh v sostave russkikh prologov XII – pervoi treti XV vekov*, Moskva 2009.
- Łużny R., *Kossów (Kosów, Kossow) Sylwester* [in:] *Polski słownik biograficzny*, t. 14, Wrocław 1968–1969, p. 326.

- Malyshevskii I., *Skazanie o poseshchenii russkoi strany siatym apostolom Andream*, «Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii» 1888, T. 2, № 6, pp. 1–350.
- Mironowicz A., *Sylwester Kossow. Biskup bialoruski, metropolita kijowski*, Białystok 1999.
- Naumow A., *Święci lokalni w myśli kijowskiej pierwszej połowy XVII wieku* [in:] *Ars Graeca – Ars Latina. Studia dedykowane Profesor Annie Różyckiej-Bryzek*, W. Balus et al. (red.), Kraków 2001, pp. 199–206.
- Nemenskiy O., *Traktovki kreshchenija Rusi v polemicheskoj literature Zapadnoj Rusi pervoj poloviny XVII veka* [in:] *Ranneje srednevekovje glazami Pozdnego srednevekovja i Rannego Novogo vremeni*, Moskva 2006, pp. 57–61.
- Plokhii S., *Nalyvaikova vira: kozactvo ta religii v ranniomodernii Ukraini*, Kyiv 2006.
- Preobrazhenskii A.S., *Vladimir (Vasilii) Sviatoslavich* [in:] *Pravoslavnaia encyklopediia*, Moskva 2004, vol. 8, pp. 690–718.
- Psaltyr' s vossledovaniem*, Kiev 1643.
- Rudnytsky I.L., *Ukraine between East and West* [in:] *Das östliche Mitteleuropa in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Wiesbaden 1966, pp. 163–169.
- Sevcenko I., *Ukraine between East and West. Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century*, Edmonton–Toronto 1996.
- Sinopsis* [Kiev 1681], Facsimile mit einer Einleitung H. Rothe, Köln 1983.
- Sirenov A.V., *Stepennaia kniga i russkaia istoricheskaia mysl' XVI–XVIII vv.*, Moskva–Sankt-Peterburg 2010.
- Spasskii Sergii, *Polnyi mesiaceslov Vostoka*, vol. II, Moskva 1876.
- Strykowski M., *Kronika polska, litewska, żmudzka i wszystkiej Rusi*, Królewiec 1582.
- Sysyn F.E., *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653*, Cambridge, MA 1985.
- The Travels of Macarius, Patriarch of Antioch: Written by his Attendant Archdeacon, Paul of Aleppo, in Arabic*, F.C. Belfour (transl.), London 1833.
- Voitovych L., *Kniazha doba: portrety elity*, Bila Cerkva 2006.
- Zapysky sviatytelia Petra Mohyly, uporiadkuvannia I.V. Zhylenko*, Kyiv 2011.
- Zatyliuk I., *Gramota Andriia Boholiubs'kogo Kyievo-Pechers'komu monastyriu*, «Ruthenica» 2008, vol. VII, pp. 215–235.
- Zatyliuk I., *Mynule Rusi u kyivskiykh tvorakh XVII stolittia: teksty, avtory, chytachi, dysertaciia... kandydata istorychnykh nauk*, Kyiv 2013.
-